

Mow Cop residents split over demise of bike ride

By James Byrne

The cancellation of a popular annual bike ride up Mow Cop's infamous Killer Mile has split the opinions of residents.

Some have waved "good riddance" while others have called the cancellation of Kilo To Go's tenth annual Cheshire event a "great shame".

The company, which

organises a number of yearly bike events across the country, has recently ceased trading due to insolvency meaning its future events are cancelled, including its Cheshire Cat run.

The course included the uphill road that climbs to the top of Mow Cop, known as Killer Mile, and also passed Jodrell Bank and Gawsorth Hall.

The village's residents took to the Mow Cop Facebook page

to discuss the event's cancellation.

Bob Cooper said it was "great news" and added that cyclists who took part "caused chaos and loads of mess in the village".

Simon Harbridge added: "That's fabulous news, good riddance!"

"They've been a real pain with foul language and using peoples' properties as toilets leaving energy gel wrappers everywhere with a lack of marshalling."

"I'm so surprised someone hasn't got hurt in the past, it's come very close on some occasions."

Mr Harbridge added that in his experience the event was usually poorly managed with "no marshals at dangerous points of which there are many and no one follows to clean up after them".

Katie Gwilt, however, said the loss of Kilo To Go was nothing to celebrate as it encouraged people to get out and exercise.

She explained: "I think it's a great shame. I think that we can live with chaos for one day of the year if it encourages more people to get out and about and enjoy the beautiful area we live in."

Mrs Gwilt added: "There will always be a small number of inconsiderate idiots at any event or gathering, unfortunately the minority spoil it for the majority."

On Thursday, 19th May, runners will take on the gruelling Killer Mile for the annual running race up the hill organised by the Mow Cop Resident's Association.

Des Ball, chairman, said that the association "bends over backwards" to keep village residents happy and said that it takes a great deal of organisation.

On Kilo To Go, he said: "I have heard it doesn't get a good response and because they're just passing through Mow Cop in a sense this makes a big difference."

"It was encouraging to have it here originally a few years ago, but it is all about cleaning up after yourselves and letting neighbours know before you come up the Killer Mile."

"It's shame in one sense that it's stopped, but I don't suppose residents will be that unhappy."

The Chronicle spoke to Gary Roberts, clerk of Odd Rode Parish Council, which covers Mow Cop, who said organisers of Kilo To Go had never discussed the event with the council.

All Hallows pupils focus on careers

All Hallows College pupils recently attended a careers fair at Macclesfield Town Hall organised by Macclesfield Chamber of Commerce.

All local secondary schools and colleges were invited to send students and All Hallows allocated places for all of its year 10 students.

The chamber of commerce also used the event to launch the Macclesfield Pledge, a scheme that will forge closer links between young people and employers. All Hallows Catholic College is already involved in this initiative and has 20 students in years 10 and 11 taking part in the various activities.

Workshops were held throughout the afternoon on various topics including: going to university, CV and letter writing, and applying for apprenticeships.

The college is fed by local Catholic primary schools including St Mary's in Congleton.

You can help shape homes of the future

Residents and professionals can help shape the borough's homes of the future.

Cheshire East Council has prepared a residential design guide, which will enable residents, developers, architects and other professionals to have their input into how the borough should look in the future.

The design guide will help to set a benchmark for quality and a "sense of place" across Cheshire East with more imaginative developments that are pleasing to the eye and which meet the living standards and needs of residents and families in the 21st century.

The purpose is to provide developers and design teams with a framework that can guide them in the development of designs that are likely to be acceptable to planners in the future. This frame-

work will set out how to meet the requirements of the Design Council's *Building for Life 12*, which sets out the industry standard for the design of new housing developments.

Future applications would be expected to include detailed design-related information and offer reassurance to existing communities that development within their settlements and neighbourhoods will be delivered to a high standard.

Designs would be expected to complement existing places within Cheshire East.

The council is inviting feedback on the design guide through an online consultation, which runs until 18th May.

This can be accessed via the council's website planning portal.

Be part of something tea-riffic



Marie Curie is calling on people to hold a Blooming Great Tea Party between 20th and 29th June and support the charity, which provides care and support for people living with a terminal illness.

Whether it's a big garden party for family and friends or a small bake sale at work, every donation from a Blooming Great Tea Party will be helping Marie Curie Nurses care for more people living with a terminal illness across the UK.

Jessica Herrington, community fund-raiser for Marie Curie said: "It's easy to support Marie Curie with a Blooming Great

Tea Party and it really is up to you how you decide to join in.

"Last year in Alsager, Biddulph, Congleton and Holmes Chapel we had dozens of successful and varied events and this year we want residents to go even further and tell us about their tea-riffic plans."

"Every pound raised will enable us to help even more people living with a terminal illness, which includes those we support directly through the North Staffordshire Nursing Service."

To register, visit mariecurie.org.uk/teaparty or call 0800 716 146.

(Submitted photograph).



News: [facebook.com/chronicle.series](https://www.facebook.com/chronicle.series)

Chat: Follow our editor - search for "Jem Condcliffe"

DESIGN
Wharf
BATHROOMS BEDROOMS KITCHENS

25% off Villeroy & Boch SoHo Collection
Free Neff dishwasher with kitchen orders over £6000

www.wharfdesign.com
tel: 01260 279584

Station Yard Park Lane
Congleton CW12 3DE
Free parking Find us next to Congleton railway station
Wharf - Supplying quality products for over 50 years.

hansgrohe
pronorm Miele MasterPartner

WHAT'S THE PLAN FOR STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS?

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council is consulting over Preferred Options Site Allocations from Thurs 28th April to Mon 13th June 2016 as part of its new Local Plan.

Following on from consultation on site options held in 2015, this consultation identifies the Council's preferred sites for a variety of uses including housing, employment, retail, and gypsies and travellers. It also identifies draft development boundaries for towns and villages across the District and retail boundaries for the town centres. Copies of proposals and details of how to give us your views can be found at Council 'One Stop Shops' in Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle and at all libraries throughout the District.

Full details are at:

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

The following drop-in events are being held across the District. Maps of proposed sites and development boundaries will be displayed and Planning Officers will be present to answer questions.

Biddulph Town Hall (Main Hall - ground floor)	Weds 11th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Greatwood Community Hall, Hollington Road, Upper Tean	Thurs 12th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Oakley Room, Guildhall, Cheadle	Tues 17th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Dove Room, Moorlands House, Leek	Weds 18th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Cheddleton Community Centre	Thurs 19th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Whiston Village Hall	Weds 25th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Endon Village Hall	Fri 27th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm

Venues may be added or details changed; please check the website for latest news of events.



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING EXCELLENCE



OPENING TIMES: MONDAY TO SUNDAY FROM 9AM TO 11PM



FULL ENGLISH
BREAKFAST
FROM £7.50



2 COURSE
LUNCH
FROM £11.95



A LA CARTE MENU
EVENING DINNER



MONDAY
Steak Night
£24.95 FOR 2. INCLUDES DRINK



COMING SOON
AFTERNOON TEAS



Tuesday
FISH & CHIP FEAST

UTTOXETER'S FIRST COCKTAIL BAR

SUNDAY LUNCH

6-8 CARTER ST, UTTOXETER, STAFFORDSHIRE ST14 8EU
NEW.WHITEHARTHOTELUTTOXETER.CO.UK | TEL: 01889 562707

WHAT'S THE PLAN FOR STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS?

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council is consulting over Preferred Options Site Allocations from Thurs 28th April to Mon 13th June 2016 as part of its new Local Plan.

Following on from consultation on site options held in 2015, this consultation identifies the Council's preferred sites for a variety of uses including housing, employment, retail, and gypsies and travellers. It also identifies draft development boundaries for towns and villages across the District and retail boundaries for the town centres. Copies of proposals and details of how to give us your views can be found at Council 'One Stop Shops' in Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle and at all libraries throughout the District.

Full details are at:

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

The following drop-in events are being held across the District. Maps of proposed sites and development boundaries will be displayed and Planning Officers will be present to answer questions.

Biddulph Town Hall (Main Hall - ground floor)	Weds 11th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Greatwood Community Hall, Hollington Road, Upper Tean	Thurs 12th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Oakley Room, Guildhall, Cheadle	Tues 17th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Dove Room, Moorlands House, Leek	Weds 18th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Cheddleton Community Centre	Thurs 19th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Whiston Village Hall	Weds 25th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Endon Village Hall	Fri 27th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm

Venues may be added or details changed; please check the website for latest news of events.



Events mark anniversary

ALTON Methodist Church is holding a 190 year anniversary celebration with a series of events from May 8 to 15.

On Sunday, May 8, at 3pm a traditional Methodist worship led by Reverend Peter Barber, chairman of the Chester and Stoke Methodist District, followed by tea and refreshments.

On Monday to Saturday, May 9 to 14, at 1pm the chapel will be open to welcome people for refreshments and conversation. There will be an exhibition celebrating the work of chapels. On Sunday, May 15, at 11am at The Alton Bridge Hotel, Station Road, Alton, there will be a time of worship led by Reverend Ashley Cooper and Alton Castle Worship Band followed by a free hog roast, salads and cake.

Players wanted for girls' team

A GIRLS' football team has issued an appeal for new players.

Leek Town Strikers want girls aged between eight and 10 to join their squad.

They train at Burnwood Primary School in Chell every Tuesday from 7pm to 8pm.

Home matches are played on Saturdays in Leek.

Manager Stuart Henley said: "Everyone has a lot of fun at training." Call Stuart on 07961 026395 or one of the other coaches, Landen Burton, on 07552 705827.

Ex-policeman became renowned as historian

By Belinda Hargreaves

belinda.hargreaves@thepostandtimes.co.uk

TRIBUTES have been paid to a renowned Leek historian and former Staffordshire Police chief inspector who has died at the age of 67.

Chris Sheldon, who lived in Leek, passed away following a short illness on April 20 at the Royal Stoke University Hospital.

Born and bred in the town, Chris was educated locally and became a police cadet at the age of 17.

He later joined the regular force and served at stations across the county. His first post as a cadet was at Wolstanton. He then went onto Newcastle before being promoted to sergeant and transferring to Uttoxeter. After being promoted to inspector he worked at Longton and Kidsgrove before becoming chief inspector and working at the force's headquarters in Stafford.

As part of his career in the force, Mr Sheldon also had the role of coroner's officer in the 1970s.

His widow, Lynette, who he married in 1975 at St Luke's Church, Leek, said: "He was a very fair policeman. Everyone spoke highly of him."

Mr Sheldon retired from the



Chris Sheldon.

police force in 1999 after serving 30 years.

He was a great lover of cats and was a big supporter of Pat Woods Home for Strays in Leek.

As well as being a keen historian, Mr Sheldon often painted and any proceeds he made from his creations he would donate to the charity. Some of his paintings of police stations remain on display at The Shire Hall Gallery in Stafford.

Chris wrote six eminent books focusing on the fallen from the local area during the

first and second world wars including In Name Only, Call to War, A Debt of Honour, Path of Duty, Roll of Honour, and Longnor's Hero of Telemark.

Lynette said: "It was late on in his life when he became really interested in history."

"His mother's brother was killed in the Second World War and he first researched about him and took an interest from there."

"He would spend hours researching for the books he wrote. I think he was proud of what he produced."

"He didn't really make anything from his books, and just covered his costs. He did it to get the history of the fallen written down."

A former member of the town's Royal British Legion, Mr Sheldon was a founding member of Friends of Nicholson War Memorial and was part of the group which helped to gain the Big Lottery grant for the recent restoration of the structure at the end of Derby Street.

He also helped to put together a leaflet about the memorial and campaigned to get the names of forgotten soldiers on the structure.

Friend and fellow member of the Friends of the Nicholson War Memorial Alan Brundrett said: "Chris will not only be

missed as a friend to me but also as a friend to the Nicholson War Memorial, a cause to which he devoted a great deal of his time and energies to over many years."

Leek Town Clerk Julie Taylor added: "Chris was an eminent local historian who was instrumental in ensuring that the names of the fallen local men and women who died in the Second World War but weren't listed on the Nicholson War Memorial were recognised, and this happened in 2005 when eight names were added and again in 2014 when two more names were added."

"His careful and thorough research and willingness to give his time has been enormously helpful to all those seeking to commemorate the fallen."

"Chris's tireless contribution to the work of the Friends of the Nicholson War Memorial will be greatly missed by all those who worked with him."

Chris's funeral service will take place at St Luke's Church in Fountain Street, Leek, on Friday, May 6, at 1.45pm, followed by private interment. His coffin bearers will be six former policemen. Family flowers only please, donations if desired to Leek Home for Strays or St Luke's Church, Leek.

Top force role is up for grabs

VOTERS go to the polls this Thursday to elect a new Police and Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire.

Candidates for the post are Conservative Matthew Ellis, who was elected to the job in 2012, Labour's George Adamson, UKIP's Harold Gregory, Paul Woodhead of the Green Party and independent Natalie Devaney.

When voters first went to the polls four years ago to elect a police and crime commissioner, Staffordshire had the lowest turnout in the country, at just 11.97 per cent.

It was a battle between Conservative and Labour, with Matthew Ellis picking up 51,237 votes, 3,648 more than Joy Garner.

It was said at the time that residents didn't understand the role of a PCC. Now four years on, officials are hoping for a significantly better turnout.

The role of PCCs is to be the voice of the people and scrutinise the force.

They can hold their chief constable to account, and along with appointing them they can also dismiss them.

Commissioners also set the force budget and the amount expected from council tax payers.

ONLINE
For news, sport and features visit
www.leek-news.co.uk

WHAT'S THE PLAN FOR STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS?

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council is consulting over Preferred Options Site Allocations from Thurs 28th April to Mon 13th June 2016 as part of its new Local Plan.

Following on from consultation on site options held in 2015, this consultation identifies the Council's preferred sites for a variety of uses including housing, employment, retail, and gypsies and travellers. It also identifies draft development boundaries for towns and villages across the District and retail boundaries for the town centres. Copies of proposals and details of how to give us your views can be found at Council One Stop Shops in Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle and at all libraries throughout the District.

Full details are at:

www.staffs-moorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

The following drop-in events are being held across the District. Maps of proposed sites and development boundaries will be displayed and Planning Officers will be present to answer questions.

Biddulph Town Hall (Main Hall - ground floor)	Weds 11th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Greatwood Community Hall, Hollington Road, Upper Tean	Thurs 12th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Oakley Room, Guildhall, Cheadle	Tues 17th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Dove Room, Moorlands House, Leek	Weds 18th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Cheddleton Community Centre	Thurs 19th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Whiston Village Hall	Weds 25th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Endon Village Hall	Fri 27th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm

Venues may be added or details changed; please check the website for latest news of events.



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING EXCELLENCE

OLW

Staffordshire Chambers Business

AWARDS 2016

YOUR TIME TO SHINE

Enter Staffordshire Chambers of Commerce Business Awards 2016

#StaffsBizAwards
staffordshirechambers.co.uk

Staffordshire Chambers of Commerce

Supported by



WHAT'S THE PLAN FOR STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS?

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council is consulting over Preferred Options Site Allocations from Thurs 28th April to Mon 13th June 2016 as part of its new Local Plan.

Following on from consultation on site options held in 2015, this consultation identifies the Council's preferred sites for a variety of uses including housing, employment, retail, and gypsies and travellers. It also identifies draft development boundaries for towns and villages across the District and retail boundaries for the town centres. Copies of proposals and details of how to give us your views can be found at Council 'One Stop Shops' in Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle and at all libraries throughout the District.

Full details are at:

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

The following drop-in events are being held across the District. Maps of proposed sites and development boundaries will be displayed and Planning Officers will be present to answer questions.

Biddulph Town Hall (Main Hall - ground floor)	Weds 11th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Greatwood Community Hall, Hollington Road, Upper Tean	Thurs 12th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Oakley Room, Guildhall, Cheadle	Tues 17th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Dove Room, Moorlands House, Leek	Weds 18th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Cheddleton Community Centre	Thurs 19th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Whiston Village Hall	Weds 25th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Endon Village Hall	Fri 27th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm

Venues may be added or details changed; please check the website for latest news of events.



NOTE: If you have received this leaflet but live within the Peak District National Park or any area outside the Staffordshire Moorlands please disregard the above.



**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN
NOTIFICATION OF CONSULTATION ON PREFERRED OPTIONS SITE ALLOCATIONS AND
BOUNDARIES - 28TH APRIL TO 13TH JUNE 2016**

This postcard is intended to notify you of consultation on the above document giving you the opportunity to comment on its contents if you wish to. The consultation identifies the preferred site options for new homes and businesses across the District's towns and villages. It also proposes areas of open space, changes to the Green Belt, draft development/infill boundaries for these towns and villages, and retail boundaries for the town centres.

All documentation related to this consultation and details of the drop in events can be viewed online through the District Council's website at www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations.

A copy of the consultation document is also available to view during normal office hours at Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek; Cheadle One Stop Shop, High Street, Cheadle; and Biddulph One Stop Shop, Town Hall, High Street, Biddulph; as well as Biddulph Library, Werrington Library & Blythe Bridge Library

All comments received by **5.00pm on Monday 13th June 2016** will be carefully considered before the Council selects its final development sites.

If you require further information or advice regarding this consultation please email the Forward Plans team at forward.plans@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk.

Note – Please contact the Council on the above email address if you no longer wish to be kept informed about new planning policy documents and we will remove your details from our database.



**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN
NOTIFICATION OF CONSULTATION ON PREFERRED OPTIONS SITE ALLOCATIONS AND
BOUNDARIES - 28TH APRIL TO 13TH JUNE 2016**

This postcard is intended to notify you of consultation on the above document giving you the opportunity to comment on its contents if you wish to. The consultation identifies the preferred site options for new homes and businesses across the District's towns and villages. It also proposes areas of open space, changes to the Green Belt, draft development/infill boundaries for these towns and villages, and retail boundaries for the town centres.

All documentation related to this consultation and details of the drop in events can be viewed online through the District Council's website at www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations.

A copy of the consultation document is also available to view during normal office hours at Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek; Cheadle One Stop Shop, High Street, Cheadle; and Biddulph One Stop Shop, Town Hall, High Street, Biddulph; as well as Biddulph Library, Werrington Library & Blythe Bridge Library

All comments received by **5.00pm on Monday 13th June 2016** will be carefully considered before the Council selects its final development sites.

If you require further information or advice regarding this consultation please email the Forward Plans team at forward.plans@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk.

Note – Please contact the Council on the above email address if you no longer wish to be kept informed about new planning policy documents and we will remove your details from our database.

Office use only: Name.....Organisation.....



Preferred Options Sites and Development Boundaries Consultation – Response Form

Name:

Address:

.....
.....
.....

E-Mail contact:

.....

Agent (if applicable).....

Please return this form by **5pm** on **13th June 2016** by:

Email to: forward.plans@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk or by post to:

Freepost RRLJ-XCTC-JBZK
Forward Plans
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Regeneration Services
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ.

Further information: www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

Office use only: Name.....Organisation.....

Please note you may submit multiple comments forms and should submit separate responses if you have comments relating to more than one question, site, boundary etc.

1. Which question in the consultation booklet are you responding to?
QUESTION NUMBER.....
2. If your comments relate to a preferred site, boundary or area, please provide the reference:
SITE REFERENCE (see consultation map)
SETTLEMENT
3. What is the nature of your comment?
(Please select one answer)
Support.....☐ Object.....☐ General Comment.....☐
4. Please provide your comments below. You may attach additional sheets of paper if required.

Thank you for your response.

SITE NOTICE : STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN 2016-2031 PUBLIC CONSULTATION OVER PREFERRED OPTIONS SITE ALLOCATIONS

SITE REF:.....
PROPOSED USE(S):.....

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council is consulting over Preferred Options Site Allocations from Thursday 28th April to Monday 13th June 2016 as part of its new Local Plan.

Following on from consultation on site options held in 2015, this consultation identifies the Council's preferred sites for a variety of uses including housing, employment, retail, and gypsies and travellers. It also identifies draft development boundaries for towns and villages across the District and retail boundaries for the town centres. Copies of proposals and details of how to give the Council your views can be found at Council 'One Stop Shops' in Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle and at all libraries throughout the District.

Full details are at:

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/siteallocations

Representations can be made between the above dates. It should be noted that any representations made during this consultation will be available for public inspection and copy, and representations cannot be made anonymously. Please quote the above site reference if making representations about this site.

The following drop-in events are also being held across the District. Maps of proposed sites and development boundaries will be displayed and Planning Officers will be present to answer questions.

Biddulph Town Hall (Main Hall - ground floor)	Weds 11th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Greatwood Community Hall, Hollington Road, Upper Tean	Thurs 12th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Oakley Room, Guildhall, Cheadle	Tues 17th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Dove Room, Moorlands House, Leek	Weds 18th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Cheddleton Community Centre	Thurs 19th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Whiston Village Hall	Weds 25th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm
Endon Village Hall	Fri 27th May 2016	5.00pm - 8.00pm

Venues may be added or details changed; please check the website for latest news of events.

OTHER SUGGESTED BIDDULPH SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
IN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY			
BD004	In the settlement boundary See RAG table for site details	<u>SCC Highways</u> Access off City Bank requires visibility over third party land. There can be no intensification of use of this access without a visibility improvement. Can this plot be combined with BD064 and BD138a? <u>Contamination</u> Possible contamination from former mill? <u>Ownership</u> No certainty over owner – appears to be one individual for part of site but large part unregistered. Have written to him several times most recently 12/8/16 to establish whether he would be willing to release land for development or not? Awaiting reply.	No
Chells Builders Merchants	In town boundary Existing employment use but business has been asked to move.	<u>Ownership</u> Landowner won't release (18/08/2016). Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation.	No
Land on east side of Biddulph Bypass (currently designated Visual Open Space)	In town boundary. <u>VOS Designation</u> Allocated as VOS in Biddulph Town Centre AAP. The Visual Open Space (VOS) next to Chells has been re-assessed along with all the other VOS designations as part of the Landscape, Heritage and Local Green Space Study as this	<u>Ownership</u> Landowner won't release (18/08/2016). Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
	is now an old designation which is not included within National Planning Policy Guidance. The NPPF allows Council's to allocate 'Local Green Space' which meets specific criteria within Local Plans. This particular site is not considered suitable for a Local Green Space designation as it does not meet the criteria so there is an opportunity to consider it as a development site.		
Brown Lees Chapel	Too small for an allocation. Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary.		No
Jackson's Nursery BD108	See site pro-forma – already included as a proposed allocation.		Yes
Meadows Playing Field	Sport England would object and it would need to be replaced elsewhere, needed as open space for new housing.		No
Redundant and under-utilised buildings around Congleton Rd/Cross St/ Stringer St/ Walley St and Station Rd. (photograph attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is a brownfield urban site which requires regeneration and redevelopment, existing businesses could be re-located within a mixed use development of affordable starter homes and business units, similar to the development in Fairfax Close opposite the site - this is an area of the town that is constantly referred to by Biddulph Residents as a reason to object to ANY greenfield development.		See response on mills – Yarn Mill, Minster Mill, Albion Mills, Gas Yard and Town Councils Masterplan.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
BD101 Yarn Mill	Owner supports (email of 9/8/2016)	See RAG table for site details	Yes
BD102 Minster Mill	Owner supports (email of 16/5/14)	See RAG table for site details	Yes
Albion Mills, Station Road	<u>Planning history</u> 93/00639/OLD – Change of use to gym and fitness centre APPROVED - SMD/2010/0777 – Demolition of existing building and construction of 9 town houses (outline) to include access and layout. REFUSED - SMD/2011/0783 - Demolition of existing building and construction of 9 town houses (outline) APPROVED (expired in 2014) - SMD/2013/0894 – Change of use to 6 self contained flats INVALID	Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall. Biddulph Town Council's Masterplan is considering this area and this could assist in bringing the site forward. There is clearly developer interest as this is reflected in the planning history.	No
Gas Works Station Road	(Land is apparently up for sale) Gas works yard has had planning approval in the past for 2 dwellings SMD/2007/1063. A subsequent attempt was made for 4 dwellings also in 2007 which was refused.	Contamination Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
Site adjacent Victoria Court, Brown Lees Rd, Brown Lees (photograph attached)	A small site that could mirror the Victoria Court Apartments on Brown Lees Rd which would have good links to A527, the BVW NCR55 and new primary school at Brown Lees. 	Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall. Owner intent - unknown Viability of apartments - unknown	No
IN GREEN BELT			
Former Quarry off Tunstall Road / Bemersley Road		Green Belt <u>Green Belt Review (Site 8 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release reflecting the absence of an outer boundary, with no clear feature to contain development which would contribute to sprawl along the A527 Biddulph Road towards Brindley Ford. <u>Mining legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show it's a high risk development area but no	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer). <u>Owner</u> Unknown <u>Contamination</u> May be an issue due to previous use.	
Land East of Childerplay Road		Green Belt <u>Green Belt Review (Site 1 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release because of the role of Green Belt in containing Biddulph, the scale and poorly bounded character of the site on its eastern extent. <u>Mining legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show that around two thirds of the site is a high risk development area but no mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer). <u>Ownership</u> Unknown	
The old Bemersley Road council tip site adjoining Childerplay Road.	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> Childerplay Lane (photograph attached) This area, is the old industrial centre of Biddulph South, on both sides of the road straddle the old Whiston Slag Company, discharged with disposing and processing iron ore slag from Robert Heath's iron works and latterly on the south side, an opencast coal mine. As a consequence, the land quality is very poor. I would propose that the northern side of the road is utilised for open air business use - re-locating the hauliers from Wharf Road in Biddulph Town, whilst the southern side bordered by Bermersley Road from "The Matador" is used as a business industrial estate.	Green Belt <u>Green Belt Review (Site 7 – 2016)</u> Not recommended for release reflecting its separation from the built edge of Biddulph and effect on openness. <u>Contamination</u> Due to previous use. <u>Mining Legacy</u> Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show that vast majority of site is a high risk development area but no mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) “it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer).	
Land North of Woodhouse Lane, between Woodhouse Middle School and Woodhouse Farm	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> A small but significant parcel of land about the same size as Newpool which has excellent connectivity to the A527 via Woodhouse Lane, local schools and shops on Smithy Lane/Congleton Rd. Considering the land lost off Pennine Way, this would be the only development within this sector of Biddulph North.	Green Belt. Considered in SHLAA but C Class due to potential impact on Registered Park and Garden and National Trust property. Was not a site option.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
Derelict farm buildings and Pottery on Mow Lane, Gillow Heath (photograph attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is small but significant site within the greenbelt, but consists of two areas of dereliction either side of Mow Lane, this would be ideal for an "Executive Home/ Barn Conversion to produce 8 - 12 quality units, the development of which would remove a crumbling eyesore, and allow for footpath instigation on this section of Mow Lane. The footprint of the plot would be within the "brown" land with current trees being retained as a screen.	Not suitable for allocation - In the Green Belt and open countryside – does not directly adjoin the town boundary. Could possibly be developed under existing NPPF policy if brownfield and new development not having a greater impact on openness of Green Belt than what is already on the site.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
Derelict farm buildings and Pottery on Mow Lane, Gillow Heath (photograph attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This is small but significant site within the greenbelt, but consists of two areas of dereliction either side of Mow Lane, this would be ideal for an "Executive Home/ Barn Conversion to produce 8 - 12 quality units, the development of which would remove a crumbling eyesore, and allow for footpath instigation on this section of Mow Lane. The footprint of the plot would be within the "brown" land with current trees being retained as a screen;	Not suitable for allocation - In the Green Belt and open countryside – does not directly adjoin the town boundary. Could possibly be developed under existing NPPF policy if brownfield and new development not having a greater impact on openness of Green Belt than what is already on the site.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
Change of status from Mixed Use to Affordable Housing (photograph attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This site was originally allocated to Mixed Use - business and housing, the close proximity to Victoria Row and Mill Hayes recreational area and the potential primary school nearby would render the site eminently more suited to 100% housing, this would be a far more acceptable proposition, with business being reallocated to the poor land at A036/A036a	Childerplay Lane sites are not considered suitable for Green Belt Release (see above) so employment could not be moved there. There is a demand for employment units in the town and this is considered to be the most suitable site to achieve this, having good road links and being adjacent to the Victoria Business Park as well as being considered suitable for Green Belt Release. The housing element on the site will assist with viability. Therefore, it is recommended that the mixed use allocation on this site remains.	Yes – retain as mixed use employment / housing site.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
ALTERNATIVE BROWN LEES SITE / Site Known as 'Victoria Colliery' (photographs attached)	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> This site was promoted during and after the opencast and subsequent land reclamation as mixed business and housing with a significant public open space together with an improved former railway trackbed into the Biddulph Valley Way NCR55 - little of this has happened. The fields within the SMDC boundary adjacent to the A527 can provide a significant number of housing, the BVW NCR55 could be metalled and made into a safer route to the town centre and Brown Lees, whilst servicing a Primary School built on land at A050/A051 below. This is a potentially large site with excellent access to Brown Lees Rd at the head of the BVW NCR55, leading up to Brook St, if the site incorporates the unmodernised farm and outbuildings at the western head of the site. The site is large	(SHLAA record says - FRA needed. SW floodplain and watercourses on site. Surface Water sewer seems to discharge to site) Mining legacy – former open cast mining area. Statmap layers provided by Coal Authority show it's a high risk development area (surface mining) but no mine entries are shown on the site. Coal Authority (general response – not site specific) "it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
	enough - especially with the potential of building a school and providing playing fields on NuL Administered Land adjacent to the site. Access could also be considered opposite Lyneside Road aside the Gardener's Arms Public House. <u>Green Belt Review (Site 9 – 2016)</u> “Potential for release under Exceptional Circumstances but proposed outer boundary does not extend to the valley/brook boundary and careful master planning would be required to ensure sensitive modelling of the built edge of Biddulph in this location. Development would have an impact on openness but this is considered not to be significant in light of topography and vegetation cover. Extend town boundary.” Landowner – Willing to release land for development.	development is safe, stable and sustainable.” (Viability issue – investigative work required by developer). Highways – Brook St not acceptable as main access as there are already issues at the Brook St / Brown Lees Road junction but suitable as a secondary access. Primary access should be further towards Tunstall Road but can't achieve this without acquiring third party land. Only other option is to re-direct Biddulph Valley Way to achieve access there. This approach is ok with County Highways. Access not likely adjacent to Gardener's Arms PH as the land is under 3 different titles so multiple owners are involved. Location of site in relation to the town centre – on the southern edge. Site not recommended for taking forward into Preferred Options Local Plan due to: • An alternative Green Belt site exists adjacent to Wharf Road which will assist with bringing forward a large strategic mixed use regeneration site which is well related to the town centre and its key services and facilities.	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
	 		

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
			
BD109/118/ Land off Brook St - Alternative to BD063a?	See RAG table	GBR says not suitable for release.	No
BD144 West of Towerhill Road - Possible alternative to BD063a?	See RAG table	GBR says not suitable for release.	No
Larger part of BD063a	Owner supports - (see agents response)	Green Belt <u>Green Belt Review (Site 3 – 2016)</u> The site is on gently rising land to the rear of Newpool Road and as such presents relatively limited visual intrusion and hence limited impact on openness, but has no significant outer boundary with which to contain development. The site appears to seek to	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		‘round off’ the settlement edge in this location between Tower Hill Road and Newpool Farm, but in so doing cuts across fields and in only one instance uses a recognisable field boundary. In addition, the site does not abut existing development off Meadowside, leaving a remnant field. Not recommended for release due to the absence of a clear outer boundary with which to properly contain development, thus preventing localised sprawl. More modest rounding-off to the east of the site could be considered, using a farm track as a boundary to development.	
BD137	Owner supports	Green Belt Review Parcel N7 (Land to North West of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes: • significant contribution to preventing neighbouring towns merging; • Contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built – up areas; • contribution to safeguarding countryside from encroachment; • Contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns; Permanence of GB – current boundaries are firm and largely logical. Sustainable patterns of development – “development would produce an over-extended linear settlement pattern with a limited relationship to Biddulph town proper.”	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<u>SHLAA</u> "Eastern part of site (and north) affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to stream. Blanket TPOs to northern part of site (Baileys Wood). This is also identified in PPG17 audit as natural and semi natural open space. Also historic earthwork here. BVW west" (c class)	
BD083	See RAG table	A meeting was held with the Green Belt Consultants and officers on 18th August 2016. Site BD083 was discussed at that meeting and the consultant's view was that the site is on rising land, the sense of openness would be compromised by development and it is disconnected from urban area, (the Biddulph Valley Way separates it from nearby residential development).	No
Land at Conway House off Harlech Drive	Owner supports if adjacent land is developed.	Same issue as ADD04 – impact on Heritage.	No
Land associated with 62 Mill Hayes Road	<u>Supporter's Comments</u> Request that land associated with 62 Mill Hayes Road (your reference BD131 - see attached map) be considered for release from the Green Belt. The land extends to 6.35 acres and has a road frontage which would provide the best point of access into land north of Mill Hayes Road.	Green Belt. <u>Green Belt Review</u> Allows for release of the land if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. <u>Other Issues</u> If developed alone appears incongruous – would have to be part of a wider development for this area. Close to a site of geological importance.	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.	
Underwood Farm, Gillow Heath, Biddulph	Owner supports	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Not recommended for release. Development would be a clear intrusion into open countryside, without substantial boundaries with which it could be contained. A new built edge to Gillow Heath (and Biddulph) would be created which would be of a linear character and not constitute a logical rounding-off of the settlement. <u>SHLAA</u> Part A – divorced from settlement. Not assessed in SHLAA Part B – Partial SHLAA assessment – BD123 (old coal yard only – divorced from settlement – may be NPPF compliant as it is brownfield?) C class in SHLAA. BD139 – “The whole of the site has been identified in the Landscape & Settlement Setting Study as being important to the setting of the settlement. Rural character of the area. Wedgewood Lane provides a strong edge to the settlement at this point. FRA needed.” – C class.	No
Marsh Green Nursery off Well Lane Gillow Heath	Promoted by agent on behalf of owner.	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances. Notwithstanding the	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		contribution of the land to the Green Belt in this locality, development would not cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt, reflecting the bounded nature of the site and the character of existing built form, combining both residential properties and the garden nursery. Of the two options, the smaller would be less damaging, being more closely related to the current built edge at Well Lane and limiting the interface with open countryside to the north west. However, there is no obvious significant feature between the two options which would serve as a reasonable long term boundary. <u>SCC Highways</u> Marsh Green Road is poor and would really need some improvement before I could be comfortable with development using it as access. It would need at least widening but if sites BD068 and BD083 are still proposed, these would be significantly beneficial. All sites could then contribute to improvements at Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road junction. BD083 would be essential. The existing traffic generation of the existing use as nursery could be taken into account to offset against the proposed residential use. Transport Statement would be required. However, given the poor geometry and alignment of Marsh Green Road, some	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		improvement would be essential for any sizeable development. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.	
BD067a-c	See RAG table	GBR does not support.	No
BD138a and BD138b	See agent's comments (2 owners and 2 agents) See RAG table	GBR does not support.	No
Hurst Quarry, Hurst Road	Owner supports – see agent's comments <u>Recent planning application</u> SMD/2016/0127 - withdrawn	<u>Green Belt Review:</u> Parcel N8 (Land to north east of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes: • Check unrestricted sprawl; • Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment; • Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Permanence of GB – Characterised by strong logical boundaries along inner and outer edges. Sustainable patterns of development – development not appropriate. Impact on Green Belt and unsustainable location. (Would have to argue on brownfield land NPPF policy)	No
BD064	<u>Owner supports</u> Recent email from owner's representative.	<u>Included at Site Options Stage</u> Not included at Preferred Options Stage because not recommended for release from	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		GB in GB Review. See RAG table for site details <u>Green Belt Review</u> “The land (including BD138a and BD138b) retains a clear open countryside character, development of which would create visual intrusion and compromise openness, notwithstanding the boundaries provided by Wedgewood Lane / Marshfield Lane/ and an unmade track to Congleton Edge Road”. Not recommended for release. <u>Highways</u> The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a TA.	
Newpool Rd Caravan site	Owner willing to release land for development.	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances, reflecting no change in the built footprint of development in this location. The site is clearly bounded by the current extent of development, with no risk of sprawl or encroachment into the wider open countryside to the north, and is attached to development at Newpool Road. Difficult to justify exceptional circumstances for release from Green Belt of such a small	No

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		site. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.	
Forge Colour Works, Congleton Road	Has planning permission and developers are working to implement it – has contamination issues so have been talking to Environmental Health.	Significant contamination issues.	No
Land on the west side of Biddulph bypass at Woodside Farm	Land available, next to proposed acceptable site, close to town centre, easy access via already proposed site. Needs investigation and consultation according to NP WP. <u>Ownership</u> 2 owners – willing to release for development.	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances. Development could be considered without significant damage to the wider Green Belt, although there would be an impact on openness given the location of the land. The site largely sits within low-lying land and is clearly bounded to the north and to the east. The south western boundary is problematic, however, comprising various insubstantial hedgerows as well as being arranged by field pattern and not a clear feature which would constitute a logical and permanent external boundary. This would constitute a new settlement edge which would have to be created, without which there would be a danger of sprawl into open countryside over the longer term. <u>SCC Highways</u> Alternative access - crossing Biddulph Valley Way in central part of site and integrate with BD071 scheme is acceptable to County Highways.	Yes

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	RECOMMENDED ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<u>Biddulph Valley Way Crossing</u> There are covenants in place associated with crossing this former railway line to gain access and these are being investigated with Network Rail. (See site proforma for full details)	
Former industrial site (formerly an old steel mill)	Located within the urban area. Part of Brown Lees Industrial Estate.		No
OUTSIDE STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT			
Brownfield sites in SOT e.g. Brindley Ford old minerals sites within Stoke and Newcastle.		Stoke-on-Trent City Council and Newcastle Borough Council have both been asked whether they would consider development on the old minerals sites within their boundary to meet Staffordshire Moorlands housing requirements. The feedback received in response to this has been negative. Also, circumstances have changed since last year and it is considered that the District can meet its own development needs without using land outside its boundary.	No

OTHER SUGGESTED CHEADLE SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
OUTSIDE GREEN BELT			
Thorley Drive (Keepmoat) Nor submitted as part of consultation.	Suggested for housing . SMD/2016/0083 has outline for 60 dwellings. Land to south and west suggested as extension to existing planning approval.	- Important to the setting of the settlement in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Character Assessment. - Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Study consider that the site is of high sensitivity, unlikely that the site could be developed without adversely affecting the settlement pattern and encroaching on the wider countryside. Development of the site could also affect the rural approach to Cheadle as views of development - Wider site previously refused by Planning Committee.	No – previously considered as options site.
IN GREEN BELT			
Harewood Grange Farm (Gregory Grey) PO7032	Suggested for housing. Close proximity to JCB employment site.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement.	No – other non GB sites available.
Land west of Friars Close (Ken Wainman on behalf of Mr and Mrs Harrison) PO334	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No – other non GB sites available.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
Park Lane (CH168) Ben Weatherley PO6934	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size (5 dwellings).	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that the overall impact of development on the purposes of Green Belt was considered to be significant and would create an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. Land identified as important setting to the settlement.	No – other non GB sites available
Park Lane (CH016b) Mrs Wilshaw PO99	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No – other non GB sites available.
Nursery Close (Gez Willard) PO6843 (Brown area)	Suggested for housing. Sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size (10 dwellings).	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that land in this area is vulnerable to urbanisation. Land identified as important setting to the settlement	No- other non GB sites available.
CH093 (John Wren on behalf of Mr Campbell) PO479	Suggested for housing. Land should be taken out of the GB.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to release this area from the GB. GB review states that the overall impact of development on the purposes of Green Belt was considered to be moderate. Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study identified land as high landscape sensitivity and would not fit in well with the existing settlement pattern and encroach into open countryside.	No- other non GB sites available.
Ms Harrison	Suggested for employment uses.	Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances to	No- other non GB

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
(3 areas) PO6936		release these areas from the GB. Areas 1 & 2 fall within parcel S15 of the Green Belt review and there is some evidence of a role in helping to contain the various industrial intrusions. Area 3 falls within parcel S17 of the Green Belt review which comprises a complex parcel and is seen to check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard from encroachment.	sites available.

OTHER SUGGESTED LEEK SITES FROM PREFERRED SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION APRIL 2016

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
IN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY			
Hughes Concrete/	Outline planning permission SMD/2014/0750 on this site for housing and other uses. Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary. Also area is identified as part of the Cornhill opportunity site in the adopted Churnet Valley Masterplan SPD.	<u>No need to allocate – site has permission</u>	No – already has planning approval
Land at Barnfields Industrial Estate	Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary	Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved.	No – existing industrial area
“Use disused mills in the town”	[Unspecified].	<u>Included in Large Site Windfall Allowance:</u> unidentified sites in the town boundary are already considered as part of the windfall assumptions in the Local Plan. Schemes arising upon such sites would be treated against relevant Development Plan policies on their own merits. No need to allocate. Note that the following urban mills already enjoy planning consent: - Portland Mill- redevelopment for 35 dwellings (SMD/2015/0523) - London Mill (London St)- redevelopment for 93 dwellings (SMD/2015/0586)	No – included within large site windfall allowance. Some urban mills already enjoy residential consent.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		• London Mill (Ashbourne Rd)- conversion for 21 light industrial units (SMD/2016/0113) • Big Mill/Shade Mill/Print Works (Belle Vue)- conversion to apartments across all three buildings [and subsequent consents for extensions].(SMD/2004/0254).	
“Unused land at Sainsburys”	9+ha site, mostly within town boundary; with 3.1ha lying in open countryside to north (1.5ha open space plus car parking and other areas). Major outline consent 10/00041/OMAJEI for supermarket, retail, business units, housing, petrol station and open space across entire site has been partially completed. The disused remainder could therefore be completed at any time. Applications for alternative schemes on the disused remainder would be assessed on their merits. A third party agent responded to 2016 consultation proposing entire undeveloped Churnet Works area be allocated for mixed uses including retail, employment, housing, hotel, leisure with a consequential amendment to the town boundary line to include this (including northern open space area).	<u>Northern open space heavily affected by floodplain (FZ3+FZ2). Western parts of undeveloped area also affected by Floodzone2/3.</u> Consent contained remediation conditions (ground gas).	No - Site already has mixed use consent. Town boundary to be amended at this location to north, to encompass entire area covered by 10/00041/ OMAJEI consent.
Churnet Valley Farm, off Macclesfield Road (LE002)	Flat fields/hockey pitch in NW of Leek. In FZ2 (Churnet River).	Site is <u>FLOODZONE 2</u>.The Council would need to justify pursuant to the sequential test set out in the NPPF, why this site in FZ2 was selected before other sites outside FZ2/3.	No - Floodzone

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		<u>Landscape</u> Identified as important landscape setting to settlement. <u>Availability</u> Unknown	
Land off Westwood Park Drive (LE126a)	Very steeply sloping site within development boundary. Adjacent to TPOs. Approx. 2.76ha. SCC Highways: The access track off Westwood Park Drive appears too narrow...Access off Davenport Close may be acceptable if the garages could be acquired and demolished (and replacement parking provided). Either access route would seem to need additional land.	<u>Access</u> Site appears to be landlocked by existing development. Narrow agricultural access – insufficient for large scale residential development. <u>Landscape</u> Identified as important landscape setting to settlement. Visually prominent site. <u>Topography</u> Potentially too steep to develop. <u>Availability</u> Unknown	No – topography / access (although some small scale windfall development may be possible.). No owner support.
Adams Foods (LE154)	Outline planning permission SMD/2013/0561 approved for 60 units lapsed November 2016.	Site has been sold for employment use.	No – Sold for employment
Bode Business Park (LE243)	Representation submitted by WYG on behalf of landowner. Suggest re-location of the Key Plant Automation Limited business and considers residential use is suitable. Considers that new employment land opportunities offer an oversupply and therefore loss of LE243 will have no detrimental impact.	<u>Employment Use</u> Loss of employment use. Site is of a good size 2ha and protected by CS Policy E2. Need to retain range of employment sites in Leek. Possible contamination	No – retain for employment

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	Site Area - approx. 2ha Capacity – approx 50 – 60 dwellings (WYG) <u>SMDC Environmental health</u>: Some constraints on residential development: Contamination from industrial use, gas issues from adjacent fowlchurch tip		
Former Working Mens Club and sports pitch, Ball Haye Green (LE259)	Representation submitted by Steven Abbot Assocs on behalf of landowner. Access available off Ball Haye Green road.	<u>Outdoor Sports Facility</u> Forms part of the supply of outdoor sports provision for Leek. Future balance of outdoor sports facilities (AMR) shows a shortfall for Leek. This is currently being reviewed (Playing Pitch and Open Space update). Sports facilities are protected by Core Strategy Policy C2 and Section 8 NPPF. <u>Local Green Space</u> Landscape, LGS & Heritage Impact Study identified area as potential Local Green Space and will be protected from development.	No – sports pitch and Local Green Space
IN GREEN BELT			
Land around Foker Grange, Macclesfield Rd, Leek (LE144)	Agricultural fields abutting town development boundary and west of Macclesfield Road, before Foker Grange Farm access, in Green Belt. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement	<u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt review considers this parcel (N15) forms the northern gateway to Leek and is potentially vulnerable to urbanisation along the A523 with some evidence of this occurring. • Check unrestricted sprawl – significant contribution • Prevent towns merging – limited contribution	No – Green Belt

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		• Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution • Setting of towns – significant contribution • Assist regeneration – limited contribution • Overall – contribution Landscape Does not relate well to existing settlement and is at a higher level than the town. Prominent site on approach into town. <u>Availability</u> Unknown	
Land west of Macclesfield Road (LE103)	Site abuts town boundary, in Green Belt, sloping down to the river Churnet with extensive tree cover along boundaries and NE part of site. In agricultural use. Site partially falls within important landscape setting to Leek in 2008 LSCA.	Land west of Macclesfield Road (LE103) <u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt review recommends that this site not be released from the Green Belt for development as it has a ‘moderate’ overall impact upon the five Green Belt Purposes • check sprawl= significant contribution • maintain separation=limited contribution • prevent encroachment=significant contribution • preserve setting =contribution. <u>Landscape</u> Identified as (partially) important landscape	No – Green Belt Site slopes down to the river Churnet with extensive tree cover along boundaries and NE part of site. In agricultural use.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		setting to settlement. Sloping site, partial site screening, but partially visible from main road. Rural appearance. Small strip of site to south affected by floodzone2/FZ3 (River Churnet). <u>Availability</u> Unknown.	
Land southeast of Mollatt's Wood Road, Ladderedge	Site suggested by Rob Duncan consultancy on behalf of landowner. 0.57ha site lying in the Green Belt, approx 20m SE of existing Leek (Ladderedge) town boundary; accessed off Mollatt's Wood Road. Public right of way runs down road to Caldon Canal. Greenfield, relatively flat, appears to have some on-site trees. Open landscape to E/S. 2006 consent for stable block at southern end. Does not form part of important landscape setting to Leek in 2008 LSCA.	<u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt Review recommends that land parcel 'C3' which includes this land, not be released from the Green Belt for development as overall makes a 'contribution' to the function of the Green Belt, when measured against the five Green Belt purposes (including a 'significant contribution' to checking unrestricted sprawl). Site is not immediately adjacent to the Leek town boundary. <u>Sustainability</u> Site on edge of Leek, approx 2.8km from edge of town centre. Mollatt's Wood Road is narrow cul de sac and unclear if adopted across entire length. Allowance would need to be made for public right of way users.	No - Green Belt Distance from town centre

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
		On-site trees, that would be the subject of protection (or compensation) under the Council's emerging Local Plan Policy NE2.	
IN COUNTRYSIDE (NOT GREEN BELT)			
Land at Milltown Way (LE057 and adjacent land to north and west)	Site is adjacent to town boundary. Falls within Ladydale SBI. A number of TPOs lie within site. Leek Conservation area lies under 100m West. Approx 6.27ha site (accessed off Milltown Way)suggested by Gladmans Devts Ltd who argue: • site sustainably located, and not in Green belt • close to public transport links • landscape and heritage impacts associated with previous refusals/appeal dismissals can be overcome with reduced development area • site available/deliverable/achievable • although within LSCA important landscape setting to Leek, this should not preclude allocation of site Site has been subject to a number of unsuccessful residential applications (including dismissed appeals). The most recent SMD/2016/0413 reduced the number of proposed dwellings from 90 to 25 and set aside open spaces/planting within site to overcome the landscape and heritage impact reasons for the previous refusals.	• Site falls entirely within an SBI (Ladydale) • TPOs across site (woodland/group/tree), particularly at NW. • Grade II listed Pickwood Hall and grounds lie around 100m south • Town conservation area 100m west SMD/2016/0413 was refused on: • Harm to setting of Pickwood Hall (after mitigation) • Harm to character of local landscape setting • Social and economic benefits of only 25 dwellings not substantial enough to outweigh harm	No – landscape and heritage impacts; SBI impacts requiring compensation.
Kniveden Hall site (LE066), Mount Rd Leek	Site located about 120m east of town boundary, across Mount Road. SCC LLFA Officer - FRA needed. No specific concerns. SCC Highways - Mount Road should be improved including	<u>Ownership</u> Landowner SCC are still promoting this site for residential use. <u>Landscape</u> Although screened, site is located beyond the	Y – Site is closely related to other Mount sites, is a brownfield site with perimeter screening, with

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	pedestrian links. Footway should be provided on frontage. SFRA – Nothing relevant.	ridge of Mount Road, which currently screens views of Leek from the PDNP. According to 2016 Local Greenspace and Heritage Impact Study, development within the site would be visually prominent. Site is of high landscape sensitivity.	owner support. Site-specific policy can specify landscape mitigation requirements.
Field at Pike Hall Farm, Mount Rd, Leek LE069	Former farmhouse with 2 vacant barns and agricultural field. Some perimeter trees to W and N. Relatively flat, slight slope down to High View Road. Area TPOs in field to immediate north. 2014 ecological study of site concludes site has species poor grassland, hedgerows and scattered planted broadleaved trees habitats present on site which are particularly common in the UK, have low biodiversity value therefore site deemed to have a low ecological importance. Not in a flood risk zone but SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer refers to existing flooding problem downstream at Ashbourne Road and questions where surface water will go. A FRA is required. Listed building within 170m to west • SHLAA correspondence with agent 2015 confirming would consider releasing land possibly later in the development plan period; • agent Knights on behalf of Renew Land Developments responded to 2016 Preferred Options promoting LE069, LE127, LE128a, LE128b combined	<u>Landscape</u> Site is of high landscape sensitivity in Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement. At a higher level than the houses on High View Road <u>Amenity</u> Site within 270m of approved 34m wind turbine at Kniveden Farm to east. <u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> Refers to site being inaccessible to existing areas of employment, and proximity to heritage assets, as being negative effects.	No – site of high landscape sensitivity. Site considered inappropriate due to visual impact, loss of openness and views over Leek.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	for housing allocation stating the land is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable. During March 2016 Member workshops LE128 and LE069 were not considered appropriate due to visual impact, openness and views over Leek.		
Land west of Mount Road (southern part of LE128 ("LE128B"))	Undulating agricultural field, slopes down to High view Road. Some perimeter trees to W. Area TPOs in field to immediate south (part of site but excluded from net area). 2014 ecological study of site concludes site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area as it consists solely of species poor improved grassland with one species poor hedgerow. Therefore the site has been deemed to have low ecological importance. Not in a flood risk zone but SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer questions where surface water will go. A FRA is required. Listed building within 200m to west - In 2015 Site Options, C Kemshead acting on behalf of landowners confirmed all LE128 is available for development and that the owners are willing. Further reps stating this submitted to 2016 Preferred Options. - agent Knights on behalf of Renew Land Developments responded to 2016 Preferred Options	<u>Landscape</u> Site is of medium landscape sensitivity in Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement. Site-specific landscape mitigation measures recommended include planting, landscaping, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. <u>Amenity</u> Site within 230m of approved 34m wind turbine at Kniveden Farm to east. <u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> Refers to site being inaccessible to existing areas of employment, and proximity to heritage assets, as being negative effects.	Y – Site is closely related to other Mount sites , with owner support. Site-specific policy can specify landscape mitigation requirements and the exclusion of the southern Area TPOs from development.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	promoting LE069, LE127, LE128a, LE128b combined for housing allocation stating the land is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable. During March 2016 Member workshops LE128 and LE069 were not considered appropriate due to visual impact, openness and views over Leek.		
Land at Home Farm, Macclesfield Road, Leek (LE138)	Land parcels east of Macclesfield Road after entrances to Leek Cricket Club and Home Farm. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement Not immediately adjacent to town boundary. SCC LLFA Officer - No significant concerns. SFRA - Nothing relevant. Environment Agency: No comment SCC Highways: use of the existing access adjacent to the cricket club would not be acceptable. Visibility towards Leek is very poor. A new access on the Macclesfield Road frontage would be acceptable subject to access design and visibility splay which should be achievable.	Owner of land around Home Farm submitted a SHLAA form for site "LE138" (roadside fields) only, not adjacent fields. Site attracted a 'C' rating in SHLAA so was not included in 2015 site options. <u>Availability</u> A small area of the site is unregistered (owner unknown). The representative of the landowner for the majority (registered) part of the site confirmed they have no intrinsic objection to its inclusion in the Local Plan. <u>Landscape</u> The site is not well related to the existing town – isolated location. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement.	No - The site is not well related to the existing town boundary – isolated location.
Land at Leek Cricket Club, Macclesfield Road, Leek	Land parcels east of Macclesfield Road before entrance to Leek Cricket Club.	<u>Leek Cricket Club Outdoor Sports Facility</u> Although a private facility, forms part of the supply of outdoor sports provision for Leek.	No – sports pitch

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	Leek Cricket Club is a private facility currently in use. SFRA - Nothing relevant. SCC Highways: A new access road has been proposed for the cricket club when previous housing applications etc have been considered...This would need to be provided to a greater spec than previously discussed and the internal access roads improved. Would residential development be instead of the cricket club? Or limited development and the cricket club remain open? SCC LLFA Officer: Leek Cricket Club has no flood risk issues. Just a matter of sorting a sustainable drainage system for the site. But there is no obvious discharge route for surface water from the site. [Refer to LLFA comments to application FRM/2017/043]. So this will need a bit more work to establish a drainage route, even at outline stage. Environment Agency: No comment	Future balance of outdoor sports facilities (AMR) shows a shortfall for Leek. This is currently being reviewed (Playing Pitch and Open Space update) but unlikely to be surplus. Sports facilities are protected by Core Strategy Policy C2 and Section 8 NPPF.	
Land east of Leek Cricket Club, Macclesfield Road, Leek (LE102)	Land parcel east of Macclesfield Road before entrance to Leek Cricket Club. Considered as a site option. Relatively small greenfield site, sloping down to the south. Mature trees along boundary of site. Not identified as important landscape setting to settlement. Suggested by owners in 2016 consultation. SHLAA: Capacity 20. Area 0.59 ha. Density 34 dph.	<u>Landscape</u> Site abuts development boundary and land to the north has recent planning approval (granted at appeal) for 11 houses. Not identified as being important landscape setting to settlement. Mature trees along boundary of site although site options concluded 'that there are topography issues due to the sloping nature of the site which makes its development undesirable'.	Y –small greenfield site surrounded by town boundary to N/E/S. Some potential but dismissed at site options stage - 20 dwellings. Landscape and amenity mitigation measures could be

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	SCC Highways: Access should be gained off Bridge End with Bridge End reconstructed as far as proposed access. Additional access onto Macclesfield Road is undesirable. SCC LLFA Officer – no significant concerns. Environment Agency: No comment. SMDC Env Health - Some constraints on residential development: Possible industrial noise source as adjacent to Chemical works	<u>Flood Risk</u> SFRA – shows “multiple historic flood records” centred on Macclesfield Road adjacent to this site. However, SCC LLFA Officer has not raised any concerns and it is not located in a floodzone. Adjacent to industrial chemicals complex to E.	considered at application stage.
Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor (OC038)	Complex of redundant MOD buildings in between Leek and Blackshaw Moor east of Buxton Road	<u>Site has planning approval</u> Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.	No – planning approval
Land around Leek Edge Farm (LE143A), Buxton Road, Leek	Agricultural fields NE of Leek off Buxton Road. 11.25ha site suggested as part of development masterplan in Preferred Options consultation. Report submitted by agent Hourigan Connolly on behalf of landowners, argues that: • Site is well located to essential facilities within/around Leek (schools/education, retail, doctors, employment opportunities)– many within 2km walk/cycle. 2 bus stops nearby etc – all services stop at town centre • Access point feasible; pedestrian & cycle access and footways would be provided • Site lies within Natural England ‘South West Peak’	<u>Landscape & Heritage</u> Site does not immediately abut town boundary or adjacent development. Large area likely to have landscape impact. Site is also in close proximity to Edge End Farm – listed. Also potentially affects setting of Peak Park. <u>Habitats Regulations Assessment</u> Proximity to European sites needs to be considered. <u>SA</u> The SA refers to negative effects of heritage	No – site too separated from existing town boundary; large area likely to have landscape impact (including Peak Park). May also be heritage impacts.

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	character area; however does not form important landscape setting to Leek in LSCA, and does not lie close to significant public footpaths/important open space • Site would be visible from Roaches, but negligible amongst surroundings. Site visible from short section of National park, but effects negligible (contours). Views from footpaths are distant • Eastern landscape screening; and screening facing listed building, would be provided on site • The visual relationship with the listed farm is obscured by intervening building. • Development would be economically viable • Part of site is brownfield • There are inherent highway safety deficiencies regarding highway access to the Mount sites Small part of site identified as important landscape setting to settlement Listed 'Edge End Farm' complex 130m to NE SCC Highways don't object subject to provision of visibility splays; It would be preferable for access to be split, with part of the development being served from Thorncliffe Road and part from Buxton Road. Transport Assessment would be required which should include assessment of the accesses and of A53/Thorncliffe Road junctions. SCC LLFA Officer: Flood Risk Assessment needed. SW floodplain and watercourse on site. Consult EA and SCC.	impacts and of inaccessibility to services/facilities/employment. Site sits on road served by 'less frequent' bus route.	

SITE LOCATION	SITE INFO	KNOWN CONSTRAINTS	INCLUDE AS ALLOCATION? Y/N
	Environment Agency: No comment SFRA - Nothing relevant. SA - The SA refers to negative effects of heritage impacts and of inaccessibility to services/facilities/employment. Site sits on road served by 'less frequent' bus route.		

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Alton		
Land at Battlesteads, Alton. AL013	The site was identified as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Site identified in the L & SCA as being important to the setting of the settlement. Steeply sloping. Not considered suitable for development due to its location and relationship to the village.	No. Not well related to settlement.
Biddulph Moor		
BM008	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 recommended the site was not released	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Land off Farmside Lane opposite Broomfields (site is a smaller part of SHLAA sites BM021/BM030/BM031)	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 recommended the site was not released due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded southeastern edge of the site.	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Site off Chapel Lane opposite Cottage Lane (part of BM035)	This is part of BM035 fronting the road. BM035 was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review 2015 considered it was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 appraised the smaller area of BM035 and also recommended it was unsuitable for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded western edge of the site.	removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Land off Woodhouse Lane Part of BM012	- This is a small site off Woodlane that has not previously considered on its own. It forms a small part of SHLAA site BM012 which was classed C and was not considered suitable for development due to landscape impact and possible flooding issues. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 considered there was potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although a northern boundary is absent. Retain existing village boundary.	No Landscape impact/flooding issues. Green
Site off Chapel Lane opposite Cottage Lane (part of BM035)	- This is part of BM035 fronting the road. BM035 was in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review 2015 considered it was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 appraised the smaller area of BM035 and also recommended it was unsuitable for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded western edge of the site.	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Blythe Bridge		
Land at Heath Farm	The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Land at Uttoxeter Road	The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
BB021	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Highway Authority advised that without major improvements access is only suitable to serve one or two properties, the existing access onto A521 is single width & adjacent to watercourse - The Phase 1 Ecological Study found site maybe suitable for SBI has potential floral diversity. Recommended whole site not allocated due to its intrinsic value & potential value to biodiversity in the area.	No. Access and biodiversity issues.
BB87 Traveller	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for employment and/or housing and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Environment Agency advised the site is likely to be affected by flood risk and would require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA.	No. Potential flooding issues, landscape impact. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	- The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
BB027/ BB028	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. - The Highway Authority advised that the unadopted access road to the sites would need to be improved and ideally improvements to the visibility at its junction with Caverswall Road. Ownership of the road would also need to be established as would any access rights to the proposal sites. - The Phase 1 Ecological Study found there is a Biodiversity Alert Site immediately to the south of the site and recommended the creation of a buffer of planted trees/vegetation between the site and the BAS.	No. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access and biodiversity issues.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
BB40 & ADD10	- Site BB040 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and site ADD010 was suggested during the 2015 consultation, neither sites were taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Environment Agency advised regarding BB040 that previous land uses may have caused contamination and a Preliminary Risk Assessment would be required. Remediation and mitigation measures may be required and could impact on development potential. - The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified BB040 as being important to the setting of the settlement. - Both sites are within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that BB040 could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Environment Agency identified potential site contamination issues.
BB044	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Highway Authority considered access improvements would be required which would be difficult to achieve without third party land - The Phase 1 Ecological Study concluded that the site is an important UKBAP wet woodland and advise it should not be developed.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Access would require improvements. Site has biodiversity value.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
BB042 BB043	The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. The site was identified in the L & SCA as being important to the landscape setting of the settlement it is considered the scale of site and landscape impact would make it unsuitable.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Landscape impact.
BB062	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.	No. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt
Forsbrook		
land at Tater Lane.	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages. Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan. The Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages. Limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside /Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt . The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Brown Edge		
BE032	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Environment Agency informed the Council that the site has a culverted watercourse flowing beneath it which should be re-naturalised through redevelopment to contribute towards WFD (Water Framework Directive) objectives. They stated that this may take up space within the site, however it may be possible to divert the channel round the edge to create more developable space. The County Council's Lead Local Flood Officer stated that "there is an existing significant flooding problem in this area, which SCC are suggesting a future project for. The problem leads to flooding of the southern part of this site." Although it seems likely that this issue can be overcome, there is uncertainty at this stage as to how this will affect the capacity and viability of the site. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Potential flooding issues.
BE056	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement • The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site	Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access issues and landscape impact.
BE060	• The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement • The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Landscape impact and access issues.
BE044	• The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. - The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement - The Highway Authority had concerns about the creation of a suitable access to serve the site	considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Access issues and landscape impact.
Rock Cottage Nursing Home	- The site is in the Green Belt and is not well related to the settlement. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The NPPF allows for limited development of brownfield sites in the Green Belt.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Cheddleton		
Staffordshire Farmers site CD030	An application for residential development has been approved by planning committee (subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement) for the Staffordshire Farmers site (Jan 2017).	No. Site has existing planning permission.
CD015	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Landscape impact.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified the site as being important to the setting of the settlement	
CD069a	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. The Site Options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is a small site within the village boundary and it was not considered that allocation was necessary as development could be classed as infill.	No. Allocation not needed for site to be developed is within village boundary.
CD115	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 for mixed use/alternative uses it was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt
CD116	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Development would be a significant extension into the Green Belt - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Land alongside CD017 & CD019	The sites are in the Green Belt and are not well related to the built up area. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Not well related to built up area.
CN01 at Ox Pasture, (proposed open space)	- The land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. - The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 29). It is considered that the site provides very attractive views from the footpath on southern boundary out towards wider countryside (including the church and roaches). It is also tranquil and there is wildlife value in hedgerows. It is recommended that the whole site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances.	No. Proposed LGS allocation.
Land at Cheadle Road Ox Pasture	See comments above	
Land south of Caldon Canal	The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016)	No. Proposed LGS allocation
Cheddleton Heath		
Land off Cheddleton Heath Road/Basford Lane	This area is within the Green Belt and is not within a defined settlement. The emerging Local Plan only seeks to allocate residential sites within the main towns and larger villages. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Not well related to existing village boundaries.
Checkley		

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Land to rear of Red Lion public house and adjoining sites.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
CRESSWELL		
OC055.	western portion of land with planning consent for development allocated	No. Site already has planning permission
DILHORNE		
Land north of William Rose, Godley Lane, Dilhorne	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside and Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
land at School Close, Dilhorne	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
Endon		
Park Farm Park Lane Weavers yard	- The site is in the Green Belt and is not well related to the settlement. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The NPPF allows for limited development of brownfield sites in the Green Belt.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Land at Briar Clough, Clay Lake	The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
EN030, land at Meadow Cottage,	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt
Land off High View Road near	The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of	No Green Belt site there are

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Endon Bank Farm	the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Clay Lake adjacent to the Grange.	The site is within the development boundary and can be regarded as infill,	NO Infill
Leek Road EN024	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Environment Agency advised the site is likely to be severely effected by flood risk. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Flood risk
EN092	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development - It is a large greenfield site in the Conservation Area with potential visual impact and impact on setting & long range views. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Impact on Conservation

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	Area and wider landscape.
EN108	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. - The site is in the Conservation Area and is undulating pasture. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Impact on Conservation Area and wider landscape.
EN019	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
EN101 High View Road	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The Phase I Ecological Study highlighted the TPOs on the site and the need for them to be protected unless the devolvment benefit clearly outweigh the loss of the trees	removal from the Green Belt. Possible impact on TPO trees.
FOXT		
	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
FO008.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line policy in the Local Plan	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
MB Autos off Mount Pleasant, Foxt),	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	
Hulme	•	
HU002 plus extension	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Ipstones		
Land off Belmont Road, Ipstones; (IP014a)	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - Environment Agency raised an issue regarding potential contamination due to historic landfill, may impact on site viability. - Highway Authority concerned about pedestrian access to the village would need to be demonstrated this could be provided.	No. Potential contamination and pedestrian access.
Far Lane Industrial Estate, Ipstones.	- This is an existing industrial estate in the village boundary and in view of its current use it is not considered suitable for residential allocation. - The Local Plan allows for the change of use of existing employment site to residential development in appropriate circumstances..	No. Existing industrial estate in village boundary.
Kingsley		
KG032	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Sites Appraisal 2016 found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt in light of disproportionate impact on openness through extension of the built edge of Kingsley along the A52.	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
		considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Former Youth & Community Centre	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Assessment March 2017 concluded the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. "Notwithstanding the size and current use of the site, development would constitute an extension the built footprint of the village into open countryside. Locally, this would also extend the built extent of the village towards Kingsley Holt, although there is no intervisibility between the two settlements."	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
KG005	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
KG024	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is not available for development	NO. Site not available.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Part of KG019	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Part of KG042	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
K Part of KG026a	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt..	removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Kingsley Holt		
KH018	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Part of KH009	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Leekbrook		
LB003	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Longson		
Land west of School Lane at its	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the	No. The Local Plan is not

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
junction with the main road.	Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
land north of School Lane	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
LO007	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
LO021	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Ridgeway House, Longsdon. .	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
clusters of houses along Micklea Lane and Denford Road	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
land east of Sutherland Road, Longsdon	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Garden of High View Micklea Lane	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
Stanley Moor	• The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. No exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Stockton Brook		
Quarry House Farm	• The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan. • The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages. No exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Upper Tean		
Upper Tean UT041.	• The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.	Current planning application decision pending.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	A planning application has been submitted for development on this site.	
Part of Wentlows Cheadle Road	The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016)	No
Upper Tean UT023 plus adjacent 3 fields to the north.	- UT023 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - Development of the 3 fields to the north is not considered appropriate development of this extent would be out of scale with the settlement and would not be well related to the existing pattern of settlement.	No. Scale of development.
LT001	- Site has planning permission for residential development - The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No Has planning permission The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
LT009	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
Werrington		
WE021	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Development would significantly alter the settlement edge and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries	Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	Belt.
Former Builders Yard in Winterfield Lane,	- The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The NPPF allows for limited development on brownfield sites in the Green Belt.	Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Whitmore Avenue/Radley Way Public Open Space	- The southern part of the land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. - The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 35). It is considered that the site has recreational value, clear paths and 3 points of public access. It is tranquil, away from roads and has some views out to the north. It also has wildlife value in the overgrown higher area. It is recommended that the site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances.	No. Site is proposed as a LGS
WE048	The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It is a sloping site with poor relationship to the existing built development.	No Sloping site not well related to existing development.
Field at Ashbank Brookhouses	- The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The Green Belt Review assessed this site as part of parcel C12 which it found makes significant contribution to maintain separation between settlements and safeguard the	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	countryside from encroachment.	
Land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, WE042 WE043	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It was considered there was no suitable access to the site and the site was identified in the L & SCA as forming important landscape setting. It is understood access to the site maybe able to be achieved from Tregaron Court. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Appraisals 2016 found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Linear development along Ashbank WE020	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development would be visually intrusive and would increase the linear development along the Ash Bank Road. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. - The Green Belt Review assessed this site as part of parcel C12 which it found makes significant contribution to maintain separation between settlements and safeguard the countryside from encroachment.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
The south of the housing estate on Chatsworth WE049 50 51	- Land to south of Chatsworth Drive were assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and were not considered suitable for development. L & SCA identifies the existing residential development as forming a strong edge to the settlement development would be a significant encroachment into the open countryside. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	Landscape impact.
WE063 adjacent Shepherds Lodge	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.
Land next to Sub 4 Ltd Cellarhead WE063/WE1	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 as an employment site and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this	No. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.	
WE033	WE033 is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Limited development can take place in the green belt provided it is in accord with green belt policy.	NO. Green Belt site there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal from the Green Belt. Green Belt Review considered site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
Wetley Rocks		
WR002	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The site is within the development boundary and can be regarded as infill, part of the site has residential planning permission.	No. Allocation not needed for site to be developed is within village boundary.
Whiston		
WH002	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.
WH016	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages.

Rural Areas Site Suggestions

Location	Officer Response	Take forward
	settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	
WH015	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages
WH018	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan	No. The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate sites in the smaller villages

This page is intentionally left blank

Please note that responses to Question 1 regarding the proposed housing requirement and Question 2 regarding the proposed employment land requirement were reported to the Council Assembly on the 8th March 2017

Question 3 – Do you have comments regarding the proposed retail requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO610	Mrs Ellen Faulkner				Support	Jobs must be created for any new residents or whats the point on building houses. People need jobs near to where they live. We should not be encouraging people to travel.	Support noted.
PO404	Mr David John Allen				Support	None at present	Comments noted.
PO551	Mr Terry Barber				Support	There is a great need for further employment areas in Biddulph, or else how are Biddulph people going to afford the new houses that are earmarked to be built in the area?	Comments noted. There are employment allocations included for Biddulph in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries document.
PO55	Mr Wiggins Wiggins				Object	This is a small village community and should stay as such it's why people live here.....retail is just down the road by car or bus for those that need it.	Comments noted. The need for retail development in the District is highlighted in the Council's Retail Study. Retail development has economic and social benefits particularly for those who don't have easy access to private transport.
PO389	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Object	I am concerned that Cheadle has not been allocated any retail requirements yet you are proposoing 1300+ houses. Cheadle town centre has been ruined over the last decade and if anything we need retail development to improve the town and help it to thrive. Please reconsider and encourage some of the larger stores to invest in cheadle.	The need for retail development in the District is highlighted in the Council's Retail Study. For Cheadle, the study concludes that no further foodstores or non-food retail development are requiredin the early and mid part of the plan period. A further study at a later date will consider the need in the latter part of the plan period.
PO344	Councillor Christopher Wood				Object	The site at childerplay lane is purpose built for employment land and would alleviate the pressure to build in green belt and have better road access.	Refer to Question 19 for response.
PO363	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				Object	(No reasons given)	-
PO602	DR William Callender				Object	The concentration of retail into large towns adds to traffic flows and environmental damage because of the need to travel to them. Local, perhaps community supported, retail outlets should be encouraged to provide a centre to smaller villages and a meeting point for local residents. Retail outlets, including post offices could be located within existing amenities such as village halls or public houses.	New community facilities are welcomed as long as they are not so large as to undermine town centres. This approach is supported in planning policy.
PO1622	Mr John Steele				Object	There is significant evidence that a rupture is occurring between the trends of the latter half of the 20 th Century and the new patterns of consumer behaviour. The impacts seem to be the decreasing relevance of the high street shopping experience and the lower frequentation of the supermarkets especially the larger units. The modern trends are veering sharply toward the internet with click and collect or home delivery, and more frequent but smaller convenience store shopping. Looking at the high streets of Staffs Moorlands towns it would appear there is already more than enough property and that the surplus would be better tuned over to residential which itself would improve our town centre environments.	Comments noted. The town centre retail boundaries have been tightly drawn to reflect the trends you refer to and policy has a flexible approach to the uses of peripheral properties. Residential development is also encouraged on upper floors in town centres.
PO44	Mr P Rushton				General comment	The comments at question 2 applies together with the fact that the Moorlands area will quite obviously continue to rely upon the City for major retail outlets.	Comments noted.
PO626	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	I do not have enough knowledge of Biddulph to comment.	Comment noted.

Question 3 – Do you have comments regarding the proposed retail requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO643	Mrs Christine Bratt				General comment	Serious consideration needs to be given to this site. The existing A50 has become an overcrowded urban motorway and can often be described as a car park due to the number of accidents that occur on a regular basis closing the road and diverting traffic down the old road causing chaos and mayhem for all who try to go about their daily routines. It would cost millions to improve the roadways and would offer very little employment to justify the cost.	Comments noted.
PO937	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw				General comment	Retail opportunities are always good. How about looking again at the costs of car parking in towns such as Leek and Cheadle. I purposely wait for visit these towns until after 3.30 to avoid having to pay.	Car parking charges are reviewed by the Council every year – though this is an issue outside the remit of the Local Plan.
PO843	Dr Anthony Shallcross				General comment	Hollington is a working village with jobs in agriculture, quarrying and increasingly recreation and tourism. The main problem is that young people who were born in the village cannot afford to buy properties in the village. An affordable housing development and/or a relaxation of planning restrictions on building on homesteads (see Housing) would make the village a more vibrant community with a lower age profile.	Comments noted – refer to policy in the Preferred Options Local Plan.
PO902	Dr Anthony Shallcross				General comment	The village has lost 2 shops, a mobile library and a post office in the last thirty years. A recent application to open a shop in the village was refused. The Hollington Residents' Steering Group are interested in creating an opportunity to develop markets for the sale of local produce in the village hall but a limitation to this development is the limited public car parking space near the hall. It would also be appropriate to revisit the application to SMDC for permission to open a shop in the village.	New community facilities are welcomed as long as they are not so large as to undermine town centres. This approach is supported in planning policy.

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO45	Mr P Rushton				General comment	Travellers require sites which provide ease of access to facilities and services. It follows that sites should be situated in close vicinity to commercial centres.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Note that Preferred Option site TR002 is located off the Uttoxeter Road in close proximity to the A50 roundabout; and also on the edge of 'larger village' Blythe Bridge. Other centres such as Meir and Cheadle are a short distance further. Local bus services also operate to these centres; and there is a railway station at Blythe Bridge. The Council formulated a series of options sites for traveller allocation, which appear on the website. These were the subject of sustainability appraisal, which considered road links, access to facilities etc. This assisted the Council in its decisionmaking with regards TR002. Proposals arising for travellers sites within the District, would be assessed against relevant policies set out in the Government's NPPF, and its resultant 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', as well as the Council's own Local Plan policy. These set out the importance of sustainability/accessibility of sites, to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure etc.
PO627	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Travellers requirements are a National Government requirement and I am not knowledgeable on the subject to comment further, other than the proposed sittings require very careful consideration.	Traveller requirements are calculated by Local Authorities as part of their duty under Government policy to make their own assessment of traveller need: using 'GTAAs', or similar assessments as part of wider Housing market Assessments. The policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites, is set out in the Government's NPPF, and its resultant 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', as well as the Council's own Local Plan Policy. These set out the importance of sustainability/accessibility of sites, to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure; and that development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements should be very strictly limited. Councils must also consider local amenities and impacts upon landscape and local infrastructure; and the scale of sites should relate to their surroundings. Brownfield sites are also preferred. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation at Examination. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO405	Mr David John Allen				General comment	Consider small sites spread out throughout the district is better than one super site. They are travellers.	Comments noted. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Councils can meet their residual traveller requirements across one or more sites. National traveller policy does not state that sites must be either large or small, but does state for example that the number of pitches proposed should relate to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density; and Councils should consider local environmental quality, and avoid undue pressure on local infrastructure.
PO56	Mr Wiggins Wiggins				Object	More people not enough schools, doctors etc it's a village leave it as it should be	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Government's PPTS states that new traveller sites should relate to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density; and Councils should consider local environmental quality, and avoid undue pressure on local infrastructure. The role and scale of villages across the District are set out in the Local Plan. For example Blythe Bridge is a larger village, where further growth is justified. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO97	Mr Edward Hulse				Object	The proposed Travellers site in Forsbrook - Quabbs Lane. During the meeting at Greatwood Community Hall, Tean, on Thursday 12th May, the Officer confirmed that the preferred site TR002 would not be sold by Mr Jackson as a	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Note that the Preferred Options does not contain any site

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Travellers site and there would be NO compulsory purchase. If Quabbs Lane is reconsidered as a preferred site, we would wish to object most strongly. This would be in a Green Belt area and access to it would be dangerous as it is only metres away from a blind bend. Any slow moving vehicles, ie caravans, carts etc turning onto an unmade lane opposite the Cemetery would be a major concern on this fast road. Over the past few years there have been several fatalities. Travellers children would be at risk near this road. The site has poor access to major roads. (A50). Many family members and friends are buried in this Cemetery and the thought of it being opposite a Travellers Site is totally inappropriate and insensitive. This is a sanctuary of peace and quiet which the village appreciates greatly. Mr E W Hulse. Mrs L M Hulse.	proposals at Quabbs Lane. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval.
PO100	Mr Anthony Keith Simcock				Object	I would like to object to this proposed site on the grounds of lack of school places shops and road safety. There seems to be no plans to extend schools in Blythe Bridge or Forsbrook and we have other housing I in progress. We have only a small village of shops in walking distance of this proposed site. As the local milkman I used the entrance to this site on a regular basic, and many times when I signal left to turn into the site, traffic pulling out of Uttoxter Road, Blthe Bridge pull out in front of me causing me to brake sharply. The location of the entrance after Blythe Bridge turning is not ideal for addition traffic, which the site would bring, and it would be an accident waiting to happen. If you delay your left signal ,following traffic blow their horn at you for last minute notice. It just a junction that is just not suitable for extra traffic. Further more it has been said that complusary purchase would not be used, so how do you expect to get the site as the current owners are not willing to sell it.	Refer to PO56 reponse above. The Council consults with SCC Highways/SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to development of TR002 for traveller use. In the event of future planning applications the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. The Council will have to reach a view regarding the number of outstanding traveller pitches it is required to provided for (as per its GTAA evidence), whether it is expedient to allocate a site(s); and if so the best location to do so.
PO173	Miss Suzanne Cope				Object	I completely oppose to these sites in our greenbelt areas and believe that the sites would be better suited to a brown belt area. We should be protecting this land as published on the government website under planning practice guidance and i quote "Green belt serves 5 purposes 1. to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. 2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from enroachment. 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Section 87 As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate	Site TR002 is a brownfield site. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. See response to PO627

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						development is, by definition harmful to the green belt and should NOT be approved EXCEPT is very special circumstances.	
PO212	Mr Jason Harrison				Object	I have seen at 1st hand the disruption the travelers can cause when they just are passing through the area and how much resource be it public or private resource to clear up after said visits. I also think these spaces will put extra strain on our local schools as I had to fight to get my child into Forsbrook primary school due to lack of spaces Bringing extra people into an already over subscribed schools can not be good for our children, who can get broken up from established friends they made at nursery school. (Speaking from personal experience). There is also a ready made site in Newcastle under Lyme, which is not to far away, so why not either extend that or make that the travelers site for the area?	• see para response to PO56 about infrastructure Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Traveller requirements are calculated by Local Authorities as part of their duty under Government policy to make their own assessment of traveller need: using 'GTAA's', or similar assessments as part of wider Housing market Assessments. Note that neighbouring authorities have their own traveller requirements to provide for, and whilst a general duty to cooperate exists between neighbouring planning authorities, the Council cannot rely on the existence of sites in neighbouring authorities to contribute to meeting its own needs.
PO364	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				Object		Comments noted.
PO651	Mrs Christine Bratt				Object	I strongly object to the proposal to site a traveller site at the junction of the A50 with the old road to Blythe Bridge and Tean. This site is privately owned and the owner would not b willing to sell. The site is unsuitable as it would create further traffic problems on a road that is greatly overused. The local schools are virtually full as are the doctors surgeries. It leads on to a very narrow country lane that is unsuitable for the number of vehicles a traveller site would bring if the entrance was put on this side. The road is liable to flooding and major work would be needed to improve this.	• See response to PO100 • see para response to PO56 about infrastructure Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Disposal of surface water upon public highways is the legal responsibility of the Highways Authority or Highways England.
PO1272	Mr Roger Yarwood	Planning Officer National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups			Object	We comment as follows on the above Plan. We consider the provision proposed for Traveller sites to be inadequate. Whilst the site identified at Blythe Bridge (TR002) may have some merits, it is located in the Green Belt, it has a history of enforcement action and refusals for various types of development and it is located very close to housing development and immediately adjacent to a site approved for a house. On these grounds, the delivery of the site may be problematic. Putting forward only one site denies choice. A single site for 8 pitches is too large. Sites should not exceed 5 pitches as larger sites give rise to management problems. Small family sized pitches present the best option for assimilation into the community and minimise conflict. If site TR002 is allocated, the Council should not attempt to satisfy the total need for Traveller provision at this site. This is clearly a contrivance to satisfy the GTAA requirement whilst avoiding making adequate provision.	Comments noted. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation at Examination. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See response to PO627 • See response to PO405 • The Council refers to relevant guidance, such as DCLG 2008 Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Current traveller policy does not preclude the location of traveller sites next to other forms of housing.

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						The number of pitches should be limited to 5 and additional site(s) should be allocated.	Were the Council to allocate a single site; this would not preclude fair determination of schemes arising in other areas of the District, as per PPTS and other relevant policy.
PO940	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw				Object	TR002 is the nearest potential traveller site. It is said to be useful as it is close to the A50 and makes it possible for the travellers to easily access the site. Has anyone asked travellers where they would like to have permanent sites? It seems to me that travellers like to park where they will rather than be directed to an "approved" location.	The Council consults with relevant traveller groups during all stages of the Local Plan. In the case of unauthorised encampments, the Council retains enforcement powers. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.
PO1269	Mr W Harper				Object	We comment as follows on the above Plan. We consider the provision proposed for Traveller sites to be inadequate. Whilst the site identified at Blythe Bridge (TR002) may have some merits, it is located in the Green Belt, it has a history of enforcement action and refusals for various types of development and it is located very close to housing development and immediately adjacent to a site approved for a house. On these grounds, the delivery of the site may be problematic. Putting forward only one site denies choice. A single site for 8 pitches is too large. Sites should not exceed 5 pitches as larger sites give rise to management problems. Small family sized pitches present the best option for assimilation into the community and minimise conflict. If site TR002 is allocated, the Council should not attempt to satisfy the total need for Traveller provision at this site. This is clearly a contrivance to satisfy the GTAA requirement whilst avoiding making adequate provision. The number of pitches should be limited to 5 and additional site(s) should be allocated. In our previous submissions we proposed the allocation of a site at Checkley. It is disappointing and surprising that our suggested allocation has not been included. The site is already in use as a Traveller site with a temporary planning permission (application ref. 2014/0572). It has the advantage of being located outside the Green Belt. It should be allocated as a permanent site to partly address the Council's obligation to provide a choice of Traveller pitches.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Refer to PO1272 response The Council would consider any subsequent proposals at the Checkley site against relevant National and Local Traveller Policies.
PO837	Mr Peter Davies				Object	The proposal to establish a permanent gypsy site in the Werrington area is totally wrong. I have had dealings with these people through my work over the years and they destroy any area they inhabit. Rural villages are places where people aspire to live. Having gypsy sites in such areas just degrades the whole area until it becomes a run down area.	Note that the Preferred Options does not contain any traveller site proposals at Werrington. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval.
PO898	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	This site would be better for housing development. It is too close to residential areas.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council applies relevant policies set out in the Government's NPPF, and its resultant 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', as well as the Council's own Local Plan

Question 4 – Do you have any comments regarding the proposed gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements for the Local Plan?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							policies. These set out the importance of sustainability/accessibility of sites, to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure etc. Current traveller policy does not preclude the location of traveller sites next to other forms of housing. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation (for either traveller use, or residential development) at Examination. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1028	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	Chairperson VVSM	Object	On top of a huge amount of traffic close to the Blythe Bridge roundabout this will add to the congestion.	See para response to PO100 about highways.

ID	Full Name	Company / Org	Agent Full Name	Company / Org	Object / Support/ General Comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.	Officer Response
General							
PO130 2		Severn Trent Water Limited			General comment	(Summary - please see attached file for full version). As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network regarding water supply, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.	Comments noted. Severn Trent Water Limited is a statutory consultee and the Council will continue to liaise with the organisation through the Local Plan process.
PO130 9	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary - full version is attached) United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will seek to work closely with the Council during the Local Plan process to develop a coordinated approach for delivering sustainable growth in sustainable locations. New development should be focussed in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services and infrastructure. United Utilities will continue to work with the Council to identify any infrastructure issues and appropriate resolutions throughout the development of the Local Plan. One of the roles of the Local Plan is to allocate sites to deliver specific types of development. The Council is aware from past discussions that a fuller understanding of the impact on water and wastewater infrastructure can only be achieved once more details are known, such as the timescales for development, the approach to surface water management and the chosen points of connection. Once more information is available with respect to specific development sites, which is often only at planning application stage, we will be able to better understand the potential impacts of development on infrastructure and, as a result, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with the timing for delivery of infrastructure improvements. Please note that United Utilities seeks to undertake further discussions with the Council on technical matters relating to site-specific development, such as site drainage and the Surface Water Hierarchy, once the Council identifies its preferred site allocations. In your selection criteria, we would encourage the Council to consider the availability of alternatives to the public sewerage system for surface water discharges. For example, sites with land drains or near to watercourses are a more sustainable alternative to the public sewer. United Utilities has the following comments/recommendations for consideration by the Council in preparing its detailed policies. We recommend that you include detailed policy wording in respect of any site allocations so that applicants can be clear of planning application requirements as soon as possible. Surface Water Drainage In accordance with the NPPF, the NPPG and the Ministerial Statement on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (December 2014) United	Comments noted. United Utilities is a statutory consultee and the Council will continue to liaise with the organisation through the Local Plan process. Note that emerging Local Plan policy SD5 requires that: • where sites are affected by the presence of watercourses, the Council expects developers to undertake early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority; and • wherever possible SuDS will be expected to contribute to on-site flood alleviation, as well as taking opportunities to contribute to wider Council objectives such as its emerging Green infrastructure Network; to enhancing biodiversity and recreation opportunities; landscape character etc. In some cases site-specific policies specify the requirement for the submission of an FRA. Note that emerging Local Plan policy SD3 sets

					Utilities recommends that the Council includes a policy in the emerging Local Plan on surface water management, and suggests including the following draft policy (highlighted in red) in the draft version of the document: "Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority: 1. An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system; 2. An attenuated discharge to a surface water body such as a watercourse; 3. An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system; 4. An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. Applicants wishing to discharge to public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available. Approved development proposals will be expected to be supplemented by appropriate maintenance and management regimes for surface water drainage schemes. On large sites it may be necessary to ensure the drainage proposals are part of a wider, holistic strategy which coordinates the approach to drainage between phases, between developers, and over a number of years of construction. On greenfield sites, applicants will be expected to demonstrate that the current natural discharge solution from a site is at least mimicked. On previously developed land, applicants should target a reduction of surface water discharge in accordance with the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage produced by DEFRA. In demonstrating a reduction, applicants should include clear evidence of existing positive connections from the site with associated calculations on rates of discharge. Landscaping proposals should consider what contribution the landscaping of a site can make to reducing surface water discharge. This can include hard and soft landscaping such as permeable surfaces. The treatment and processing of surface water is not a sustainable solution. Surface water should be managed at source and not transferred. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network. A discharge to groundwater or watercourse may require the consent of the Environment Agency." Infrastructure Provision As detailed above, in some instances it may be necessary to coordinate infrastructure improvements with the delivery of development. In accordance with paragraphs 156 and 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we recommend the following detailed policy is included as part of the Joint Local Plan in relation to infrastructure provision: "Once more details are known on development sites, for example the approach to surface water management and proposed connection points to the foul sewer network, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with timing for the delivery of infrastructure improvements. At the larger development sites, it may be necessary to ensure that the delivery of development is guided by strategies for infrastructure which ensure coordination between phases of development over lengthy time periods and by numerous developers. The Council will support the principle of investment in infrastructure to respond to development and environmental needs. Infrastructure is key to the delivery of sustainable development and economic growth and meeting the development needs of the Borough." We encourage the Council to carefully consider the deliverability issues and practical issues associated with sites in fragmented ownership. On such sites, we would strongly encourage the council to challenge the site promoters to present a clear site wide infrastructure strategy in advance of examination of the plan. On larger sites, it should be clearly demonstrated there is a formal mechanism in place which will ensure the landowners will work together to deliver a coordinated approach to infrastructure over the whole site. This is a key element of delivering sustainable development and is in the best interests of good planning. We strongly recommend this is addressed in advance of allocating specific sites. Water Efficiency Whilst we appreciate the Code for Sustainable Homes has now been scrapped as a result of the Government's 'Housing Standards Review' consultation, we suggest the emerging Local Plan includes a new policy regarding water efficiency measures and the design of new development as follows: "The design of new development should incorporate water efficiency measures. New development should maximise the use of permeable surfaces and the most sustainable form of drainage, and should encourage water efficiency measures including water saving and recycling measures to minimise water usage." United Utilities wishes to highlight the importance of incorporating water efficiency measures as part of the design process for all new	out the Council's support for water- (and other) sustainability measures within new or existing buildings, that exceed current regulations; and Policy SD1 expects the submission of information with major proposals, to demonstrate that the water sourcing, and other environmental impacts of the scheme, have been considered by the applicant. Emerging Local Plan Policy SD4 sets out the Council's approach to protecting amenity through controlling various forms of pollution.

						development. There are a number of methods that developers can implement to ensure their proposals are water efficient, such as utilising rainwater harvesting and greywater harvesting for example. Improvements in water efficiency help to reduce pressure on water supplies whilst also reducing the need for treatment and pumping of both clean and wastewater. Water efficiency measures contribute to the delivery of sustainable development. Health and Well-Being United Utilities recommends the following text is included as part of the Council's proposed development management policies in relation to health, well-being and residential amenity: "The proposed development of sensitive uses (such as residential) adjacent to existing sources of pollution (e.g. noise, odour, traffic etc.) must demonstrate through the submission of appropriate impact assessments that there would be no detrimental impact on future amenity."	
PO2574	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England			Object	Par 3.33 Refers to NPPF 73 and a study that was undertaken to inform the Core Strategy. This study is not named – was it the (now out of date) Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS), an open space assessment and or an indoor sports assessment (e.g. relating to the SASSOT Sports Framework perhaps? I am wondering if the reference only to designating new open space means there is an adequate supply of indoor and outdoor sports facilities – this is not clear? I am aware that (although not been directly involved in) a refresh of the PPS/Sports Strategy being undertaken jointly with North Derbyshire – has this progressed or been adopted? Should it not be referred to and used to guide this element of the Local Plan?	The Council is currently undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any outcomes will be fed into the Publication Version of the Local Plan.
PO2779	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The following comments relate solely to the protection of 'Controlled Waters' receptors. Government Policy, as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 120), states that 'where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner'. Consequently any proposal to develop land which has been subject to a previous use which may have caused contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater will need to be supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment. This should demonstrate that the risks posed to 'Controlled Waters' by any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed. We will object when a Planning Application is submitted without a Preliminary Risk Assessment and we believe there is potential for contamination and a possible risk to 'Controlled Waters' receptors. Depending on the findings of the Preliminary Risk Assessment subsequent site investigation, risk assessment and remediation may be required. Appropriate conditions can be attached to any Planning Permission granted to require these works to be completed.	Emerging Local Plan Policy SD1 Part(2) already sets out the Council's approach to development of land affected by contamination. The supporting text already clarifies that pre-application information is required in these circumstances. However for clarity further information will be added into the supporting text.
PO2846	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	We have provided to you previously a detailed education assessment of the District to inform the plan making process. Attached is a Technical Appendix that provides an update to be read alongside the original report and is based on the proposed sites and residual housing numbers in the consultation booklet. We acknowledge that the Plan provides for land to be allocated for education use in the three main towns. In order to advise on the actual size of the new school sites we will need to have further discussions with you on any likely Local Plan design requirements and potential aspirations for community use as these could affect layout and ultimately the overall site size. This would then help in framing policy for the sites. We will also need to ensure that the Plan provides a clear understanding of how the new schools will be provided and funded. (Site specific comments in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph can be found under the relevant site heading) It is noted that table 3.6 of the consultation document only lists new education infrastructure where there is a requirement for land to be allocated. As previously advised and reiterated in the Technical Appendix enclosed there are further education infrastructure requirements for the planned growth. In the three main towns there will be a need for additional Middle and High school places in Biddulph to be delivered through expansions of existing schools. In the rural area there may be a necessity for additional Primary and First school places in Brown Edge, Endon and Forsbrook due to limited capacity at schools in those areas. There is also likely to be pressure on Middle school places in the rural area and at Blythe Bridge, Endon and Moorside High Schools. As around 46% of the housing requirement for the rural area is proposed to be delivered through small sites provision it is not easy to	Comments noted. The Council is working with Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.

						predict which schools the children from those houses will seek to attend. This is more acute at Primary/First school level where the geographical area that school draws from is smaller than that of a Middle/High school that draw from a wider area. We will need to work through this with you in more detail to understand the potential infrastructure projects required and how they may be funded, which is covered in more detail below under the heading 'infrastructure provision'.	
PO2867	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	As noted in our response to the Site Options consultation the delivery of the housing requirement in the Local Plan will bring with it requirements for new and/or improved infrastructure to support that growth e.g. schools and transport. The restrictions placed on the use of S106 obligations through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations tend to favour the delivery of larger site allocations due to the pooling restrictions. It is noted that the Plan does not contain large individual sites or urban extensions. Therefore, careful consideration of how infrastructure will be delivered and funding will be required. In particular we are keen to understand: 1. how policy will be used to ensure the comprehensive development of sites (land parcels) that adjoin one another to provide a larger allocation overall; and 2. how infrastructure proposed is to be funded and the role a CIL charging schedule will play in this. On point 2 above the period of time between adoption of the Plan and implementation of a charging schedule could have implications for the amount of funding that can be collected via S106 and may result in either development being rendered unacceptable in planning terms as it is not possible to secure the necessary planning obligation or there is a shortfall in funding for infrastructure. We would therefore suggest that the preparation of a CIL charging schedule is seen as a priority and to be prepared alongside the Plan. However, we are mindful the Government is undertaking a review of CIL and the findings are due to be published shortly so this position may change dependent on any amendments Government proposes to the CIL legislation. We acknowledge that the Plan states an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being produced and we would be keen to work with you to develop this to ensure there is clarity over infrastructure requirements and delivery.	Draft Local Plan Policy SS12 sets out the Council's approach to planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
PO2895	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Comments on each of the sites have been provided previously from a transport planning perspective. We have now updated some of those comments and these are appended. With regard to proposed housing sites to the south west of Cheadle and their potential to deliver the Mobberley Link Road (western bypass), the benefits of this will need to be demonstrated through the study work identified in the Core Strategy section 8.1.53 Policy SS5c. Appended is a plan showing the protected line for this route. Presumably the access road to these proposed development sites could form the southern section of this route, although it would need to be designed to allow the required capacity for a bypass. This may be difficult to achieve if, for instance, the access road is designed in accordance with the Department for Transport's Manual for Streets. There is also the question of how many forms of access would be required to this development area which is intended to accommodate in excess of 400 dwellings. Paragraph 3.32 of the Plan refers to the safeguarding of a potential indicative route to enable provision of the bypass. However it is difficult to see how this together with the Adopted Core Strategy Policy SS5c can effectively achieve this. The policy contains the phrase: improve environmental quality and accessibility by: reducing levels of through traffic in the town centre and along the A521 and A522 promoting the longer term provision of a bypass to the west of the town. The explanatory text of the Core Strategy reads: '8.1.53 One of the most significant challenges is identifying the need and viability of a bypass to relieve through traffic in the town and provide improved access to existing and planned housing and employment areas. Whilst some junction improvements have been implemented, there remains a strong need to investigate and identify other potential solutions to improve traffic flows through the town particularly in the light of the growth aspirations for the town. A Transportation Study will therefore be required to investigate the need and viability of a bypass and/or other traffic management solutions, including a link from the A50 at Blythe Bridge to Cheadle, the implications for surrounding villages and the wider area and the scope for funding from proposed developments. This will be undertaken as part of the review of the Core	- Comments noted. - The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential SW link road. Currently there is no link between the A522 Tean Road and Brookhouse Way / A521 due to it being severed by a disused railway line. The railway line is in third party ownership and a bridge will be required to connect a link road through. The proposed link road would allow a percentage of predicted trips from the SW area to traverse Brookhouse Way / A521 opposed to solely the A522, however the level of trips which would use the A521 from this area would have a minimal effect in improving congestion within Cheadle Town Centre. The study considers that the proposed Link Road would not be a solution on its own.

						Strategy.' The bypass is also not shown on the Core Strategy Key Diagram and Inset Maps. It is noted that paragraph 3.31 of the Plan refers to a further study to explore the case and feasibility of a bypass. Therefore, currently the Core Strategy says that the need / viability for a Bypass has yet to be established and all that's shown on Map 47 Cheadle as a 'potential link road' is part of the historic route of the A521-A522 Cheadle Western Bypass afforded protection by SCC in 2002 and currently declared on searches. It needs to be appreciated that in these circumstances the 'protection' afforded by SCC to this route may be insufficient to resist a challenge from a developer.	
PO611	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				General comment	Can't really comment on this. Just hope a lot of thought goes into any plans.	Comments noted.
PO612	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				General comment	No plans seem to have made re Health care, police, schools and other public services.	National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO406	Mr David John Allen				General comment	I will leave this to the experts , other than I feel access onto the road nodes and any associated reduction in the speed limit need to be considered.	Comments noted.
PO629	Ms Alison Conybear				Object	I object strongly strongly to the alteration of the green belt, particularly to enable development. The reason the green belt is in existence is to restrict development and protect the urban boundaries and surrounding countryside. Has the provision for future schools taken into account the fact that most of the baby-boom children are now in their 40s and hence additional children increases will be through immigration only, an issue that is not prominent in this area of Britain. Therefore is suggest that there will not be a requirement for an increase in schooling. The Valley School in Oakamoor, for example, has a lack of children attending the school, not a surplus.	- The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. - See response to PO612 regarding school capacity.
PO884	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	I don't agree with the proposals to change the green belt boundaries in order to create more housing sites. We should be using brownfield sites instead.	- See response to PO629 regarding Green Belt. - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed.
PO1623	Mr John Steele				Object	This is almost laughable, all the larger elements of housing allocation require significant improvements to our roads to eliminate or reduce hazards, but we know that the Highway Authority, namely SCC, will blandly wave aside all objections from the safety of their	- Advice has been taken from the Highways Authority regarding all proposed sites. - See response to PO612 regarding the

Question 5 – Do you have any comments regarding the potential infrastructure requirements for the Local Plan?

						desktop simulations. See also the lack of provision for, schools, doctors, health care facilities, open spaces and leisure facilities.	Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Leek							
PO856	Mr Daniel Noble				General comment	In relation to the potential and reserve housing allocation at the east end of Leek and as per the Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf document, "County Education advise that there are capacity issues affecting Leek First-, Middle- and High Schools; and given the scale of housing proposed across this catchment, new capacity will be required within Leek." I have been unable to find any proposed plans to address this concern. The comments on Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf ("The District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution.") suggest no plans have been proposed. Without this important infrastructure investment I suggest that the housing consultation cannot be taken further. Surely if the school capacity problem is not solved, new housing cannot and should not be built if the intent is for affordable (family) housing.	- The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - In Leek a new First School is proposed and an extension to the existing middle school.
PO2040	Mrs Taylor	Leek Town Council			Object	The plans indicate an extension to Churnet View Middle School and a new First School on the Mount - there has been no consultation with the First Schools and maybe better to expand existing First Schools.	The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered
Biddulph							
PO17	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	There is no proposed infrastructure improvement to Biddulph apart from another supermarket and 1 primary school. No mention of investment in current schools, roads or rail connections to Biddulph.	See response to PO612 regarding the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
PO811	Mr Timothy Sproston				Object	I have concerns that the current infrastructure (Sewage, Schools and Roads) of the town will not be able to cope with the need related to additional housing. This is demonstrated most clearly around site BD062. It is proposed to put 40 homes onto, what is currently green belt land, right up to the boundary of the main sewage treatment works for the town. The impact on infrastructure here is obvious. Highways The only access to this site is via Mow lane -> Essex Drive -> York Close. Mow lane (width 4.6 meters) does not meet current design standards. There is no footpath on Mow Lane and it is already hazardous for pedestrians and drivers. The widths of the roads on both Essex drive and York close do not meet the minimum standard in the SCC Highways design guide policy. There is no other access to this site and no feasible way of improving Mow lane to accommodate the machinery to even build on BD062 as well as the additional traffic of new residents. Sewage works United Utilities have previously stated that the sewage works are currently working over capacity, additional housing around Biddulph would exacerbate this problem and the land around the sewage works may be vital if there was a need to expand. It seems insane that someone with some Planning experience or insight would be proposing to build new properties (expensive 4, 3 bed or even 2 bed social housing) in such close proximity to the main sewage works in the town - to enjoy the sights, sounds and smells.	See response to Question 19 regarding site BD062.
PO553	MRS ANGELA Turner				General comment	I think this is poorly researched, poorly understood and requires the input of third party organisations which in some cases have not shared information. In Biddulph, United Utilities is one such example. They urgently need to share their DG5 register as you state in your FRA document pg. 26/27. Properties around the sewage works suffer from sewer flooding on a regular basis and this information is missing. The pipework infrastructure cannot cope, with junctions between pipes blowing manhole covers off the top and overflowing raw sewage into the field and into the Brook causing pollution incidents. This network is over capacity (as evidenced in a Case Study regarding an upgrade in 2009 designed for approx. 17,000 population). The National Trust at Biddulph Grange are about to feed into this system as well as any proposed new housing development. Enforcement	See response to Question 19 relating to sites BD062, BD068 and BD087.

Question 5 – Do you have any comments regarding the potential infrastructure requirements for the Local Plan?

						of any amenity issues ultimately rests with SMDC. Make sure the research evidence base is correct otherwise people living in proximity to this works will suffer. This is just one example where the actual infrastructure improvement needed (on site and across the pipe network) is totally unknown.	
PO849	mr alan brown				Object	The development of ADDO3 would have a severe effect on the bio-diversity of the surrounding areas. at the consultation meeting in the Town Hall it was said a desk top survey of the area had taken place. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the area needs to be carried out and the results made public before any decisions are made.	See response to Question 19 relating to site ADD03.
PO828	mr alan brown				Object	I believe the upgrading of Akesmore Lane to provide access for the proposed development of ADD03 in Biddulph. Will create a "ratrun" that will cause Mow Lane and Tower Hill Road to become over congested. This will have a detrimental effect on area's that are predominantly occupied by elderly people making driving and pedestrian conditions on restricted country lanes unnecessarily dangerous. Also the council has just spent a lot of money upgrading the playing fields at Halls Lane (less than 500m from Akesmore Lane) in the hope of attracting more people to use them which will also increase the traffic flow of vehicles, children on bycycle's and all ages on foot. Also the current sewerage system is not able to take any further development and would have to be upgraded has this cost been taken into account?	See response to Question 19 relating to site ADD03
PO1024	Mr Peter Barnett				Object	As mentioned previously, Akesmore lane would have to be widened and Halls Road/Station road would have to,be strengthened before any building work could commence.	See response to Question 19 relating to site ADD03
Cheadle							
PO390	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				General comment	Cheadle Town centre cannot cope with anymore traffic. It would be difficult to alter due to the limited options available. A link road is a consideration but as far as i can see it goes half way through a proposed new estate. Two points here: - if the road does go through to Brookhouse industrial estate the heavy duty traffic will using it will be considerable and not appropriate for an estate road. - if the above link road is put in it would be useless unless the second half is constructed which would link Brookhouses the leek Road, where e JCB factories are.	The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential SW link road. Currently there is no link between the A522 Tean Road and Brookhouse Way / A521 due to it being severed by a disused railway line. The railway line is in third party ownership and a bridge will be required to connect a link road through. The proposed link road would allow a percentage of predicted trips from the SW area to traverse Brookhouse Way / A521 opposed to solely the A522, however the level of trips which would use the A521 from this area would have a minimal effect in improving congestion within Cheadle Town Centre. The study considers that the proposed Link Road would not be a solution on its own.
PO1060	Mr John Bevan	Cheadle Unite			General comment	See our comments/ answer to Question1 ie New link road in Green belt from JCB (built in Green belt) Leek Rd to Brookhouses, Cheadle and on over New Haden bank to Draycott & hence the A50. Perhaps JCB would contribute.	The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers that in the future further connections to a link road around the town, would potentially offer a longer term solution providing a more suitable alternative. The rationale being that additional highway infrastructure could be funded by the developer, as specified as part of the development. This could be implemented so that over a period of time, such roads would connect, forming an Outer Distributor Road network around Cheadle which could reduce vehicle throughput and congestion in the

							town centre.
Blythe Bridge							
PO101	Mr Anthony Keith Simcock				Object	As I said before the junction of Draycott Road, Uttoxter Road, Blythe Bridge and entrance to the site is not suitable for additional traffic.	See response to Question 37 relating to site BB054.
PO900	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	This plan has come out of the blue. New areas have appeared that weren't included in the previous consultation - BB041 was not on. This isn't a fair consultation as people may have expressed different views on the last consultation if it had been included at the same time. This site would be much more of an ecological loss than some of the other sites.	See response to Question 37 relating to site BB041.
PO9941	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	General comment	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: We note that the Consultation Document refers to the future preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and we reserve our position to comment on that in due course. We have reviewed the availability of services and facilities within Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook and these are highlighted within Section 5.0 to our Evidence Base Report. We consider that there are services and facilities within the settlement that can support new homes and employment opportunities proposed by St Modwen on their site.	Comments regarding the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are noted.
Brown Edge							
PO46	Mr P Rushton				Object	The housing development plans for the SMDC area have generally scant regard for the infrastructure of areas selected. It is nonsensical to impose a housing estate on the already over-populated village of Brown Edge in a location where roads are inadequate for additional traffic, sewers and drainage problematic, school at capacity level and facilities plus services are insufficient for the present population.	National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
Cheddleton							
PO15	Dr Gordon Foulkes				Object	From reading the document it would seem that the previous consultation has not been considered as I can find no reference to the plethora of comments objecting to elements of the plan and no indication that any weight has been given to these. My response to that consultation was in respect of sites CD001 and CD 002 on the Cheddleton plan. That response remains my view on the basis that to increase the traffic entering the A520 would be foolhardy. Having lived on the road for 35 years I have seen the nature and volume of traffic increase year on year with many heavy commercial vehicles using the road and the traffic volumes significantly increasing. In the place where the inevitable additional traffic would enter the road (known locally as Williamson's Hollow) there has been at least one fatality and several lesser accidents. the land in question was designated as green belt and is on the edge of the parish boundary between Weltey Rocks and Cheddleton and would blur the distinct nature of these two communities. I do hope that the term 'consultation' lives up to its name before any irreversible decisions are taken.	- Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - See responses to Question 37 relating to sites CD001 and CD002.

Endon							
PO3905	Mr J Silititoe				Object	Any large scale development in Endon must address the flooding issues, currently being discussed with the Nation Flood Forum. The major junction at Station Road/Clay Lake must be resigned to cope with additional traffic – this is a hazardous junction and will become more so with increased traffic. Any development without solving these problems will be insensitive and lacking any common sense.	Comments noted. A Level 1 SFRA has been undertaken for the district and discussions held with both the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority.
Upper Tean							
PO1029	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Object	Infrastructure in Cressswell and roads between Draycott and Tean are totally inadequate and there is neither the land nor the capacity to widen these roads.	Comments noted.
Draycott							
PO941	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw				General comment	My village of Draycott has no shops, no school, no medical services, How does the Local Plan think to address this? The hamlet of Cresswell is to get 168 new houses - surely that will just compound the misery for local residents? And then of course the Blythe Park development has to have better access to its site. Talk of two large roundabouts on roads where they go from wide to narrow in a few yards - where two large vehicles cannot safely pass seems to me to be folly of the first order. Every road leaving Draycott has at least one pinch point!! Uttoxeter Road Draycott is the only safe bypass for the A50 when it is closed. Add roundabouts and we might as well become hermits in our own homes.	The site has outline planning approval.
Hollington							
PO903	Dr Anthony Shallcross				General comment	Traffic is the major issue here. The ridiculous situation we have now is that three speed limits meet at the Quarry Bank- Main Road junction. Going east is a 30 mph, going west is 40 mph and going north it is national speed limit. Ironically the roads get narrower going north and west and there are no pavements in the village. There should be a rationalisation of the limit to 30 mph supported by traffic calming measures to combat speeding along Main Road. A speedwatch survey recently identified a traffic flow Of 166 cars in an hour of which around 17% were exceeding the 30 mph limit. The narrowness of the roads in the village combined with blind junctions on Main Road at Quarry Bank, the Cross, Ground Hollow and Firbob Lane are all accident spots. Appropriate measures such as mini roundabouts should be put in place to reduce car speeds and the associated accident risk. The planning process needs to be looked at as part of the social infrastructure. Residents of the village feel that they are caught in a catch 22 situation where residential facilities are approved for tourism but not for long term occupation.	Roads and traffic calming are the responsibility of Staffordshire County Council.
PO606	DR William Callender				General comment	Once again the plan is focussed entirely on the road infrastructure of larger towns and on major routes. However, there are significant problems to address in roads through smaller rural villages such as Hollington that are on commuter routes. Excessive (for the capability of the roads) levels of traffic and speeding, lack of footpaths, force local residents to be prisoners in there own homes at certain times of the day. The plan also appears to make no mention of broadband infrastructre developemnt which is becoming increasingly important if we want to support rural businesses and farming.	See reponse to PO903 regarding Hollington.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO47	Mr P Rushton				General comment	Disappointed that the SMDC do not seem able to follow through on their initial innovative plans for the development of Leek into a market town to rival Derbyshire and Cheshire centres; for the development of a Churnet Valley tourism corridor; for a railway link with Stoke-on-Trent and Alton Towers; and for the tourism potential of a canal basin.	Comment noted. The Preferred Options consultation only sought views on the extent of new development boundaries for Leek and other identified settlements, and regarding proposed site allocations. The earlier adopted 2014 Core Strategy and Leek Town Centre Masterplan already set out Policy to guide the future development of the town and also the Churnet Valley (in conjunction with adopted Churnet Valley Masterplan). Both also contain references to the potential railway link/canal basin. Development proposals will continue to be assessed against these policy documents.
PO188 PO381	Mr John Pigott Mrs Brenda Pigott				Object	The town boundary on the east side of Leek should remain basically as it is at present. The proposal to build along both sides of Mount Road should be removed as the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre and is a very popular route for walking, jogging and cycling. It is also the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk giving panoramic views over the centre of Leek and the hills beyond. Instead of building along Mount Road, the brownfield sites and other sites within the town boundary should be developed first. These include the following sites which were shown on the original plans but now taken out : LE 219, LE073, LE067, LE147, LE037 and LE063.	Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral “urban extensions” around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence and a Green Belt Review [refer to the “Options Sites Assessments” on the site allocations portal]. The western edge of Leek is covered by Green Belt (requiring more onerous justification to allocate compared to non-Green Belt). The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites.
PO114	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	I do not think the boundary of the town should be extended just to allow housing to be built on green spaces.	See first para response to PO188

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO225	Miss Alicia Guy				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also	See second para response to PO188
PO187	Mrs Shirley Barlow					Not my town cannot comment	Comments noted.
PO634	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	I have no comments other than why is there a need to change the boundary?	See first para response to PO188
PO407	Mr David John Allen				Support	Leek town boundary looks fine.	Comments noted.
PO3912	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Object	On behalf of my client I wish to object to the continued exclusion of my client's land from the proposed residential infill boundary for Ladderedge. [Representation Report and site plan attached].	Comments noted The site lies in the Green Belt. Note that the Council's 2015 Green Belt Review concluded that land parcel 'C3' which includes this land, overall makes a 'contribution' to the function of the Green Belt, when measured against the five Green Belt purposes (including a 'significant contribution' to checking unrestricted sprawl). Site is not immediately adjacent to the Leek town boundary. The site appears to have on-site trees, that would be the subject of protection (or compensation) under the Council's emerging Local Plan Policy NE2.
PO3919		Hourigan Connolly			Object	Hourigan Connolly is promoting land at Buxton Road, Leek for inclusion in the Staffordshire Moorlands District Local Plan as a housing allocation. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which includes response to Question 6].	Comments and confirmation of owner position, noted. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites around Leek are not required. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities.
PO3917	Ms Linda Tweats	Leek Cricket Club			Object	The cricket club would wish for the town boundary to be amended to include that area at the extreme south of its land (on the map shown in white with the name of Bank Farm in it) We would like the town boundary to be extended to include this area.	The emerging Local Plan now includes SHLAA site LE102 as a housing allocation, with a consequent amendment to the town boundary to include the site within the town.

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4394	Mr Andy Frost				Object	Boundary should be redefined to include ALL land within our client's ownership and thereby create a more logical and defensible new urban boundary. [Refer to Supporting Statement attached to Question 1].	See response to POPO3919
PO3913	Ms Mairead Kiely				Object	We note that planning permission (ref. 10/00042/OMAJEI) was granted on Churnet Works, Macclesfield Road, Leek back in 2011. This granted full planning permission for a new superstore, retail units, employment units and a petrol filling station as well as outline permission for residential development. This permission has been part implemented, for example the foodstore has been built out and is now occupied by Sainsbury's. Although the residential permission has now lapsed, other elements of the scheme such as the retail units could still be implemented under this permission. We note that the red line boundary for this planning permission extends beyond the town settlement boundary proposed in Map 4.1 'Leek West'. We also note that the Churnet Works site is not allocated for development. We consider that the town settlement boundary proposed in Map 4.1 should be extended to include the land contained within the Churnet Works planning permission. We also consider that the site should be allocated for mixed use development, having regard to its planning history and ability to meet planning needs. Given its previously proven acceptability we would suggest this allocation should encompass a range of uses including retail, employment and residential (as previously permitted and considered acceptable at this location) but also to include hotel and leisure uses.	Comments noted. The emerging Local Plan includes an amendment to the Leek town boundary to include all that land covered by the original Sainsburys approval SMD/2010/0201. This consent is still extant (with later approvals on site, eg pub) so could still be completed. Alternative schemes for mixed uses arising on the site would be assessed against relevant Local Plan and NPPF Policy.
PO3929	Mr Phil Bamford	Gladman Developments			Object	This submission provides Gladman Development's written representations on the Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation. These representations concern the following matters. Duty to Cooperate Sustainability Appraisal Objectively Assessed Housing Need Development Requirements and Distribution Green Belt Review Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries - Leek. [Refer to 2 submitted attachments to Question 1].	- Refer to Council response to Q1 - See response to PO3919 above
PO9365	Mr David & Ros Barnes & Tyrrell				Object	Response form submitted [attached] that objects to proposed town boundary amendment at ADD01.	Refer to response to PO9367 under Question 11 Table

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9111	Mr Robert Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. It is also important to note that TOURISM is a significant driver to the local Economy! Therefore the Town Gateway, especially from the PEAK PARK Buxton Road A53, needs rigorous protection from urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of The Moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive and picturesque and is a key Tourist route. The proposal area, particularly as it approaches the A53 Buxton Road junction with Thornccliffe Road and The Mount, is immediately adjacent to the SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its Historic Landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority in its protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is 'Special' in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There are a number of 'brown' sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. [Question why] for some reason these are not shown on the accompanying Consultation Maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be "The Preferred Option Housing Sites" in the view of the residents of Leek. The proposal is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the "housing requirement"[queried as unjustified] along 1 narrow lane at the most Flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the "brown sites" and protect Leek's Heritage and inheritance!	• See first para response to PO188 • See second para response to PO188 • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • The Council consults with its own Heritage Conservation Officer, and with Heritage England, during Local Plan preparation.
PO9363	Mr and Mrs David and Rosalind Barnes and Tyrrell				Object	Response form submitted [attached] that objects to proposed town boundary amendment at ADD01.	• Refer to response to PO9367 under Question 11 Table

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9548	Mr J Grindley				Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to proposed town boundary amendment [to the draft shown in 2015 Options consultation] that now includes 'Westwood Field' [LE126A]: Aesthetically the field matches/complements the grazing and mowing fields above Ladderedge Country Park and Longsdon Wood on the opposite side of the Churnet Valley. The field is owned by 12 x 'frontagers' to the field and Bluebell Wood is owned by a ..farm. The frontagers have a right of way to the field access road at all times. Because of steep gradients, access to the wood (if needed) would need to be from its south side. substantial housing development could substantially increase the flooding at the bottom of Ladderedge, River Churnet, Westwood Golf Course. A 65 dwelling development might generate 150 cars etc. This could turn current traffic congestion during school times, into gridlock [on certain streets].	The land described as Westwood Field currently lies within the development boundary of Leek and is unallocated (Blue Bell wood lies in the Green Belt). The emerging Local Plan proposed boundary shows no change at this location. The Council is only proposing Green Belt amendments where exceptional circumstances are considered to apply. The Council uses evidence to justify its 'Preferred' development boundaries. This includes landscape impact evidence and a Green Belt Review. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council considers boundary amendments. This evidence may also be used in the determination of planning applications. In the event of development proposals upon this site, the Council would need to be satisfied that adequate access to the public highway could be achieved and schemes having significant transport impacts would be assessed against relevant NPPF policy. Major schemes would also need to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage features.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Identified open space	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO382 PO189	Mrs Brenda Pigott Mr John Pigott				Mount Road as an open space	Object General comment	The proposal to build along both sides of Mount Road should be removed as the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre and is a very popular route for walking, jogging and cycling. It is also the route of the 9 mile circular walk created by SMDC - the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk. Groups of walkers come to Leek in order to walk this rural route. Walking along Mount Road with many new houses obliterating any views and fumes from increased traffic will not encourage this activity. Panoramic views over the centre of Leek and the hills beyond - including one of the highest hills in Cheshire - 500 m high Shuttlingsloe known as the 'Matterhorn of Cheshire'. Also, the Cloud hill which is seen behind Leek towards Congleton/Cheshire. The rare phenomenon of a 'double sunset' on days around midsummers day is viewed by hundreds of people from Mount Road. The Mount is a very important local amenity which the planners have completely underestimated and simply do not understand. A local resident carried out a head count on Sun 8th May between 0700 and 2000 and counted a total of 217 people using the road for recreation : 190 walkers (44 with dogs, 8 with prams), 12 cyclists, 12 joggers and 3 horse riders. These were not in organised groups but simply people enjoying the exercise, the views and the fresh air in a safe and sustainable way – no need to get the car out. If the developments proceed then inevitably Mount Road which is now a country lane would be widened and become a busy estate road and people would not want to use it for recreation.	The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence [refer to the "Options Sites Assessments" on the Council website]. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; also providing recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate).
PO121	Mrs Alison Campion				The Mount	General comment	By building hundreds of new houses in the Mount Road area, views and public spaces will be spoilt, more traffic will be created on an already narrow road. Leave this space alone for walkers and cyclists to enjoy.	• See first para response to PO382 • See second para response to PO382 • See third para response to PO382 • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them.

Question 7: Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Leek?

PO635	Ms Alison Conybeare				General	General comment	The comments related to Leek should be restricted to those more knowledgeable of the area, in the local residents.	Comments noted. The Council considers all comments received during public consultations.
PO696	Mr John Burnett				The Land currently in use by Leek High school above Springfield Road	General comment	Is this really Public Open Space? As far as I'm aware this is land used by the High school and is not available for use by the general public in the same way a public park would be. Listing it as so inaccurately defines the public open space available to the East of the town.	Not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'.
PO409	Mr David John Allen				General - all	General comment	non- at present	Comments noted.
PO1287	Justin Milward	Woodland Trust			All sites	Support	Support provision of Open Space in the Local Plan. (Further detail in the attached comments).	Support noted.
PO2039	Mrs Taylor	Leek Town Council			Leek Cricket Club	General comment	Not all the areas marked green are "public open spaces" e.g. Leek Cricket Club is a recreational space.	See response to PO696 above
PO2042	Mrs Taylor	Leek Town Council			Ball Haye Green Club	General comment	This site needs to be retained for recreational use.	Comments noted. The Preferred Options map currently displays this site as public open space. All public open space is protected by virtue of Local Plan policies and Section 8 NPPF.
PO2566	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England			All	Object	I note some of the open space designations are formal sports facilities (which is supported) but it is very important that all sports sites are captured otherwise those excluded will have lesser protection. I note that the Football Ground off Orchard Court/Grace Street for example is not designated whereas the cricket club site just to the north is - why? I also note that the playing fields associated with the secondary school are not designated – should they not be? It will be important to clarify what is designated and why (or why not) and to ensure all playing fields are clearly protected (as it is a defined function/use of open space), whether it is in Council ownership or not (Birchhall Playing Fields appears to be included?) so there is a consistent level of protection for all open space, whatever its use. This principle applies across ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS.	The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.

Question 7: Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Leek?

PO2861	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			All	Object	In relation to the areas of Open Space identified throughout the site options document it is noted that all school playing fields have been categorised as open space, some in their entirety and others appear to only include certain parts. There is no definition in the plan as to what 'Open Space' constitutes or whether it needs to be accessible to the general public. As the Plan progresses it is unclear what policy restrictions may be imposed to such land. We therefore reserve our position on 'Open Space' at school fields and suggest that further discussion is required on whether the identification of school playing fields as 'Open Space' is required given the protection afforded to playing fields already through National Planning legislation and school premises legislation?	See response to PO2566
PO3916	Ms Linda Tweats	Leek Cricket Club			Leek Cricket Club	Object	On the draft site allocations map the cricket club is shown coloured green i.e. public open space. Strictly speaking this is not the case. The cricket club is owned by its members, though membership is of course open to the general public. However it is privately owned and not in public ownership. Should it therefore be shown on the allocations map as public open space?	See response to PO696

Question 8 Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO190	Mr John Pigott				General comment	The Local Authority is considering the release of Green Belt sites in Biddulph because "the town is heavily constrained by the Green Belt so identification of a suitable site is not straightforward". The same can be said of Leek. Foker Grange and Home Farm on the western side of Leek are Green Belt sites which could be developed. Whilst the Green Belt Review identifies them as being important to the Green Belt the council has to make tough decisions about the location of new development. Foker Grange and Home Farm do not have the high public amenity value of The Mount and would provide balance to the future development of Leek.	Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Biddulph differs from Leek in that it is entirely surrounded by Green Belt, whereas Leek is not. Both towns attract a housing requirement pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy Spatial Strategy. The Council's landscape evidence considers landscape impacts across both non-Green Belt, and Green Belt land. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Note that Home Farm does not lie within the Green Belt.
PO383	mrs Brenda pigott				Object	The Local Authority is considering the release of Green Belt sites in Biddulph because "the town is heavily constrained by the Green Belt so identification of a suitable site is not straightforward". The same can be said of Leek. The Peak District National Park is only a few miles away from Mount Road so people walking on the Roaches and Ramshaw Rocks looking towards Leek do not want to see housing estates between Morridge ridge and Mount Road ridge. Foker Grange is a Green Belt site which could be developed. It is adjacent to the main Leek to Macclesfield road so a small estate could easily be built there. Whilst the Green Belt Review identifies them as being important to the Green Belt the council has to make tough decisions about the location of new development. Foker Grange does not have the high public amenity value of The Mount and would provide balance to the future development of Leek. We can't have all the houses being built on the East side of Leek.	See response to PO190 The most recent 2016 landscape impact study took into account views from the Peak Park/ eastern approaches to the town, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; and provided accompanying recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites.
PO637	Ms Alison Conybeare				Object	The greenbelt boundary should not be altered.	No Green Belt amendments are proposed for Leek.
PO697	Mr John Burnett				General comment	The lack of Green belt definition to the East of Leek Town Boundary severely restricts the notion that this area is beneficial to the community for its open space and leisure uses.	The broad extent of the Green Belt is established nationally (however local authorities can propose at Examination alterations to their boundaries for allocations or minor amendments). The east of Leek has never been covered by Green Belt. Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in

Question 8 Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. However authorities should consider scope for improving access/recreation in the Green Belt. The Council's Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies.
PO410	Mr David John Allen				Object	I feel the Greenbelt boundary should be maintained and full advantage taken with regards to infill site, with the relaxation on the overall development boundary	Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. However there is insufficient capacity to meet this need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary alone resulting in proposed sites both within the urban area, and peripheral "urban extensions". Note that Table 4.1 makes allowance for unanticipated "windfall" development within the town (resulting in a lower residual requirement). The Council would still require exceptional circumstances to justify allocating land in the Green Belt.
PO961	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				Object	Do not build on the Mount. More suitable sites are available.	• See response to PO410 • See response to PO190 • See response to PO383
PO4396	Mr Andy Frost	Frost Planning			General comment	Green Belt boundary around Leek should not be altered. Opportunities for urban extensions in non-Green Belt locations should be maximised and prioritised. [Refer to Supporting Statement attached to Question 1].	Comments noted. Note the Preferred Options did not propose any amendments at all to the Green Belt boundary of Leek. • See response to PO410 • See response to PO190 • See response to PO383
PO9114	Mr Robert Barker				Object	There are...pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation [at the Mount] and which give the Town of Leek its identity.	Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See response to PO383

Question 8 Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9125	Mr Richard Pigott				Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Mount sites: Mount Rd is local amenity LE128 is the most elevated of the sites being considered LE066 is a brownfield site and should be considered ahead of LE128 Concentrating housing allocations on east side of town would raise deliverability problems compared to other areas of town Some western Leek sites in the Green Belt are nevertheless preferable to allocate for housing, than sites at the Mount.	The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of landscape, highways etc impacts. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022/LE127/LE128/LE140/LE142A/LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). • See response to PO190 • See response to PO383

Question 8 Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9231	MRS KAREN BARKER				Object	SITES LE142a LE142b LE140 LE128a LE127 OBJECTION I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. There are also pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the Town of Leek its identity.	• See para response to PO9114

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO870 PO461	Mr Steven Hugh Proffitt			ADD09 (Leekbrook)	Object Object	I strongly object to the proposal to include site ADD09 (land off Basford Lane, Leekbrook) in the local plan for employment land/industrial development as... ...it be damaging to a beautiful part of the Staffordshire Moorlands countryside and the wildlife habitats contained therein, ...given the elevated position of the site, the creation of a hardstanding area of development will greatly contribute to the risk of flash flooding via the brook below and shortly downstream to the new residential development adjacent to the A520 which has been built on the natural flood plain, previously occupied by Joshua Wardles textiles factory. N.B. this area has previous history of flooding. ...due to it being outside the existing development boundary for Leekbrook; being adjacent to the ancient heathland and mature woodland of Cheddleton Heath - I believe development would have an adverse impact on the natural wildlife habitats contained within the heathland, and would serve as a visual intrusion into the green open space currently observed on the rise towards Cheddleton Heath, which would be highly visible to travellers along the A520 from Leek; ...furthermore access to the site would be highly impracticable due to the narrow road bridge crossing the brook, which sits just above the current industrial estate, on Basford Lane. The bridge is single track and is just wide enough to allow access from an average sized van, it would certainly not accommodate heavy road transport.	The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence, ecological evidence, and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study concluded the site is of medium landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures including restricted development and building heights on the higher ground. All current Preferred Options sites were subject to Phase I ecological surveys between 2014 and 2016; a 2016 ecology study also considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all of these preferred options. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Core Strategy Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. The 2016 survey concluded that most of the site (improved grassland) was of 'site level' nature conservation value only; however the perimeter hedgerow habitat was of higher nature conservation importance (and may qualify as a local-level nature designation, subject to further survey). A number of pre-development surveys/actions are also recommended in relation to badgers, bats and birds. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							responses regarding proposed allocations. Local Plan Policy will require that, wherever possible, development will promote the reduction of flood risk by the use of sustainable drainage techniques. Note that all evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Vehicular access to the site is anticipated via the Dockseys haulage company to the west, onto the A520, not from Basford Lane. The SCC Highways comments to the consultation are based upon this.
PO374	Mr William Battersby	Cheddleton Estates Ltd.		ADD09 (Leekbrook)	Support	I am a Director of the company which owns this site. We support this change of use and will be delighted to support the community in using it to provide employment.	Comments noted.
PO3911					Support	Cheddleton Estates Ltd wish to confirm our agreement to the proposed designation of ADD09, which we own. We would have preferred the land to be designated for housing, and in lieu of this, we would like to renew our previous offer to gift 14.85hectares of heathland in return for residential permission [Letter correspondence with District Council to 2008 attached].	The Council's Spatial Strategy in its emerging Local Plan sets out the more limited scope for expansion in 'smaller villages' such as Leekbrook, given their scale. Therefore it would be inappropriate to pursue the allocation of this 1.67ha site for housing. However the site (in combination with Leek EM2 nearby) is considered appropriate to contribute to a range of employment sites across the Leek Wards to provide choice, responding to the residual employment land requirements for the town to 2031.

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2623	Consultation Service	Natural England			ADD09 (Leekbrook)	General comment	With regard to preferred site ADD 09 please refer to our generic representation on local wildlife Sites and related information. We advise that the Council checks on this site's status accordingly. Our 'priority habitat' records (Ref – Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) show the adjoining land to the west and south of this site as a block of deciduous woodland and lowland grassland of good quality. Given the site's close proximity to lowland deciduous woodland the local plan process should seek to ensure that the provisions of policies NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources and C3 Green Infrastructure are implemented. Comments noted. Note this site was the subject of a Phase I survey incorporating LWS Assessment, as part of the Council's 2016 Ecological Study. The site report concludes that: <i>"The hedgerow habitat on site was considered of nature conservation value at the local level. Furthermore, there is reasonable potential that it may qualify as an SBI or a BAS dependent on further survey following the hedgerow evaluation and grading system outlined in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. The improved grassland habitat on site was considered of nature conservation value at the site level only. This habitat is not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines.</i> <i>Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. No species listed as important in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines were recorded and therefore no part of the site currently qualifies for consideration as an SBI or as a BAS under these criteria. However, badger may use the site and further survey for badger should be undertaken prior to any future development. Similarly, bats may also use the site and bat activity surveys should be undertaken prior to any future development. Mature trees should be further investigated to determine whether they host bat roosts."</i> In addition, a number of pre-development surveys are recommended. The Council will weigh the ecological evidence against all other relevant evidence when it selects 'preferred sites'. Note that Local Plan policies will set out for any appropriate ecological protection measures across site allocations.
PO2910	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			ADD09 (Leekbrook)	General comment	In Leekbrook site ADD09 should be required to take access off the A520. Comments noted. The Council anticipates that development would be accessed off the A520 - this expectation may be set out in a site-specific policy.

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3924	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			ADD09 (Leekbrook)	Support	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client 's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which also covers this question].	Comments noted.
PO1356	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			Broad Area EM2 (Leekbrook)	Object	Map 4.3 Leekbrook (and also Map 4.34 in Rural Areas) - It is not clear how the impact of the proposed LEEK EM2 site on the Grade II* Listed Building Fynneylane Farm and its setting has been assessed. Further information on this is required.	The maps in the consultation booklet are intended to provide summary information only; more detailed consultee responses (concerning heritage etc) are set out on the Council's Site Allocations portal, including within the 'Site Options Assessment' tables. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes a 2016 landspace and heritage impact study. This concluded that development of this site would not affect the setting of the listed building, and development of the site would be suitable in heritage terms. Note that heritage evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites.
PO2622	Consultation Service	Natural England			Broad Area EM2 (Leekbrook)	General comment	Our previous advice letter dated 14.9.15 refers regarding preferred site allocation EM2. However please refer to our generic representation on local wildlife Sites and related information. We also note that the allocation would overlay a public footpath and refer the Council to our previous advice regarding NPPF para 75 dealing with public rights of way and access. Given the site's close proximity to lowland deciduous woodland the local plan process should seek to ensure that the provisions of policies NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources and C3 Green Infrastructure are implemented.	[Refer to response to comment PO2623 above]. The site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014. The site report acknowledges the site's SBI status (and surrounding features etc); and factors this status into subsequent evaluation /conclusions, recommending the site be considered regionally important, and recommending a number of further surveys/actions would be appropriate prior to development. Note that the site was the subject of LWS Assessment in 2017. The study concluded that:

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								<i>"The site has low ecological value in its potential to support protected species. The site habitats are considered to be of nature conservation value at site level only. However, more information is required regarding the scattered trees on site in order to establish their ecological importance."</i> A number of further surveys are recommended to establish SBI status. The Council would ensure development proposals respect the routes of public rights of way; stating this in site allocations policies, where relevant. Note that Policies NE1 and C3 already seek to enhance public access to the countryside (subject to landowner agreement, where relevant). Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. Note there is a resolution to approve outline planning application SMD/2014/0678 in August 2016 (awaiting legal agreement) for the erection of B2 and B8 units on this site.
PO2711	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Broad Area EM2 (Leekbrook)	General comment	Contrary to our previous advice, a Level 2 SFRA will not be required for Leekbrook EM2. This is due to the size of the site and the fact that any floodplain is unlikely to impact on its deliverability. The watercourse running along the majority of the northern edge will still need to be modelled in detail at the application stage and the site is still subject to the Sequential Test.	Comments noted. Note there is a resolution to approve outline planning application SMD/2014/0678 in August 2016 (awaiting legal agreement) for the erection of B2 and B8 units on this site. This included the submission of an FRA.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2885	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			Broad Area EM2 (Leekbrook)	General comment	Leek EM2 is mainly within a Site of Biological Importance. This SBI supports several habitats of principal importance. The site has added value due to the diversity of habitats. In regard of NPPF biodiversity policy this site should not be included as a preferred option. If this site is taken forward the Local Plan should include policy requirement for off-site mitigation meeting Defra biodiversity offsetting requirements with replacement habitats demonstrating similar ecological connectivity.	See response PO2622 above Note that ecological evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Note there is a resolution to approve outline planning application SMD/2014/0678 in August 2016 (awaiting legal agreement) for the erection of B2 and B8 units on this site. The committee report refers to the applicant's proposed ecological compensatory measures and submitted Habitat Management Plan in response to Pol NE1; which were material factors in determination, as were the area's prior identification as a 'broad location for employment' in the Core Strategy, and the District's general residual employment and requirements for Leek. For the above reasons the site is proposed as an employment allocation in the emerging Local Plan. The site-specific policy will require schemes include appropriate ecological impact mitigation/compensation measures.
PO3923	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			Broad Area EM2 (Leekbrook)	Support	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which also covers this question].	Comments noted.
PO698	Mr John Burnett				LE150 (Newtown House)	Support	This area appears suitable for this purpose.	Comments noted.
PO906	Mrs Tracy McMullen				LE150 (Newtown House)	Object	This is indicated as being a mixed-use or employment site yet has a housing allocation of 180 dwellings. The congestion of traffic on this road with the Co-op head office and All Saints school is very heavy. Even crossing the road at a non peak time is difficult, impossible in the rush hours. Add to that another 180 houses?? What are the proposals to address this and	The emerging Local Plan anticipates that around 1.5ha of the site is anticipated for employment use; the remaining site area could accommodate approximately 179 dwellings, based on realistic housing density assumptions. The Council consults SCC Highways during every stage of Local Plan

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						why is it down as mixed use when the plan says 179 dwellings?	preparation; you can view their responses over proposed allocations on the Council's Site Allocations portal, including the 'Site Options Assessment' tables. SCC Highways did not object to mixed use development of this site subject to upgrading of access road to adoptable standard, submission of transport assessment, and further pedestrian/cycle links. In the event of development proposals upon this site, the Council would need to be satisfied that adequate and safe access to the public highway could be achieved and schemes having significant transport impacts would be assessed against relevant NPPF policy (including scope for contributions for highway improvements, where appropriate).

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1296	Justin Milward	Woodland Trust		LE150 (Newtown House)	Object	(Summary - please see attached document for full version) ASNW - Ballington Wood at Grid Ref SJ989553 is adjacent. We are concerned that proposed development adjacent or in proximity to the wood will have negative impacts on it, causing damage and potential loss. Ancient woodland is defined as an irreplaceable natural resource that has remained constantly wooded since at least AD1600. The length at which ancient woodland takes to develop and evolve (centuries, even millennia), coupled with the vital links it creates between plants, animals and soils accentuate its irreplaceable status. The varied and unique habitats ancient woodland sites provide for many of the UK's most important and threatened fauna and flora species cannot be re-created and cannot afford to be lost. With Staffordshire Moorlands District Council showing a valuable above average ancient woodland resource at 3.09% of land area compared to a UK average of 2.5%, it is critical that this irreplaceable natural resource is absolutely protected in this Document and highlighted appropriately. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways: Chemically through acidification, eutrophication and toxic pollution, Disturbance by noise, light, trampling and other human activity, Fragmentation as a result of the destruction of adjacent semi-natural habitats, Development provides a source of non-native plants and aids their colonisation, Any effect of development can impact cumulatively on ancient woodland - this is much more damaging than individual effects. We would recommend a buffer zone of at least 50 metres of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect the woodland from the change in land use on the site for each allocation. This 50m should be included as part of the policy for each site.	According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014. The site report acknowledges the site's proximity to this ancient woodland (and Ladydale SBI etc); and factors this into subsequent evaluation/conclusions, recommending a number of further surveys/actions would be appropriate prior to development, including the creation of a buffer zone with the woodland given its AWI status. Also the Council's 2016 ecology study considers the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites, concluding that LE150 "<i>has medium ecological value in its potential to support protected species. The site habitats are considered to be of nature conservation value at district level only. However, more information is required regarding the scattered trees on site in order to establish their ecological importance, and the potential to support a population of reptiles and badgers.</i>" Development proposals will need to consider the findings of these reports and will be assessed against relevant Local Plan and NPPF ecological policy including Pol NE1. Note that the emerging Local Plan will contain policies specific to tree/foliage protection and already cover ancient woodland protection. The site-specific policy fro LE150 will require schemes incorporate an eastern buffer.
PO2043	Mrs Taylor	Leek Town Council		LE150 (Newtown House)	Object	It's not an industrial location and the area would be spoilt if used for industrial purposes - it should be used for housing only.	Leek has residual general employment land requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet this to have a sound Local Plan in place.

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							General employment purposes encompasses light industry/officing through to general industry and warehousing. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses and sustainable development patterns, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The site will attract a dedicated Local Plan policy, and subsequent proposals will be assessed this and the NPPF. Strategic Policy SS4 in the emerging Local Plan provides an indication of the split between office and other industrial land requirements generally.
PO2572	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England		LE150 (Newtown House)	Object	This mixed use allocation will involve the loss of tennis courts. This needs to be justified in terms of NPPF Par 74 or the tennis courts replaced by the developer and required by supporting text in the allocations document.	The tennis courts were not included on the map as open space as they were a private facility associated with the nearby office complex. They are now disused and in poor condition.
PO2884	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council		LE150 (Newtown House)	General comment	LE150 is immediately adjacent to a Site of Biological Importance which is also Ancient Woodland and supports a habitat of principal importance. Appropriate layout and design will be required to avoid impacts on this woodland.	See response to PO1296
PO3927	Mr Jon Power			LE150 (Newtown House)	Support	HOW Planning has been instructed by the Co-operative Bank to submit representations to the Preferred Options in relation to its land ownership at Newton House in Leek (Draft Site Reference: LE150). This submission seeks to promote the exceptional opportunity at Newton House, a highly sustainable brownfield site that is suitable for a residential-led mix of uses; and to provide detailed information to the Council which can be accurately reflected in the emerging Local Plan. [The following 4 attachments are submitted: A completed Preferred Options Sites and Development Boundaries Consultation Response Form A summary letter which outlines the basis for these representations A Development Statement (prepared by HOW Planning and Masterplanners 3DReid) that fully demonstrates the development capacity of land at Newton House and the exceptional opportunity it presents to utilise a site that is suitable,	Support and attachments noted. The emerging Local Plan will contain a site-specific policy for LE150 which will provide for at least 1.5ha employment land alongside housing land; and will require incorporation of eastern wildlife buffer.

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						available and deliverable for a mix of uses An executive summary of an Employment Market Demand Review (undertaken by Cushman and Wakefield) which assesses the redevelopment potential of the site in terms of suitable land uses (bearing in mind its historic use for employment purposes), taking into account market considerations and supply and demand factors.	
PO3933	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG		LE150 (Newtown House)	General comment	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1 which states]: This is a prominent existing employment site located within a viable employment location and the site is considered to be more appropriate for employment expansion than for housing. Additionally, the development of the agricultural land to the south of Newton House would result in the merging of Leek with Birchall to the south. [Report questions the stated housing yield/density on this site; and the %age split between housing and employment uses]. The over-optimistic density is likely to result in further under delivery of housing in Leek and across the district as a whole, further increasing the shortfall.	Leek has both residual housing- and general employment- land requirements and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts. The site only encompasses curtilage to Newton House, so is not agricultural land, and already falls within the town development boundary (as does Birchall). The housing yield is based on a 34.1/ha density. However the yield in the emerging Local Plan is intended as a guide and future proposals must have regard to landscape (and other) evidence – the Council's 2016 landscape impact study concluded that the site is of low landscape sensitivity however the high point in the SE of the site should not be developed. The Council will also require the incorporation of eastern wildlife buffer within schemes. The Council must demonstrate to an inspector that the sites contained in the Local Plan are likely to come forward and viability is a key issue.
PO411	Mr David John Allen			LE235 (Cornhill)	Object	Better all employment natural extension to Leek Brook and Barnfield areas.	Leek has a residual general employment land requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet this to have a sound Local Plan in place. Whilst the Council is proposing an allocation at Leekbrook (Leek EM2) it is considered more appropriate to 'spread' provision for the town across the Leek wards (along good road links) to better serve the market. Also LE150 would benefit from proximity to a southern link road at Cornhill.

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2583	Consultation Service	Natural England		LE235 (Cornhill)	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2900	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council		LE235 (Cornhill)	General comment	Site LE235 has no obvious access route that can be determined from the plan. This should not be through the existing residential streets.	SCC Highways advise that access to the site should (whether or not via link road) be onto the existing roundabout junction onto A520, not via Sandon Street. Connectivity measures for pedestrians and cyclists into the town centre may also be appropriate. The 2016 Council Masterplan for the site similarly shows vehicular access onto this roundabout only.
PO2883	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council		LE235 (Cornhill)	General comment	LE235 includes a Biodiversity Alert Site supporting a habitat of principal importance. Off-site mitigation of loss of this habitat would be required to meet NPPF biodiversity policy guidance.	The Council's Core Strategy Policy NE1 (Biodiversity and Geological Resources) sets out the circumstances when mitigatory or compensatory measures would be required for development proposals affecting regional/local designated sites. The Council commissioned ecological consultants in 2016 to carry out a detailed phase I ecological survey for the Cornhill site, including LWS assessment of the western BAS. It concluded that connecting habitat should be maintained as much as possible along the southern and western boundaries of LE235; and that the BAS area continues to support diverse grassland of sufficient value to qualify as an SBI. Therefore

Question 9 Do you have any comments on the proposed mixed-use or employment sites in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company Organisation / Agent Name	Company Organisation	Allocation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							compensation for development of the BAS should be made (alternative habitat area). The study also made recommendations for further actions/survey work in the event of future development. The site-specific policy in the emerging Local Plan will require that appropriate mitigatory/compensatory measures apply to development of the BAS. Proposals would also have to conform to the Biodiversity and Geological Resources policy in the emerging Local Plan, Cornhill masterplan, and ecological report for the site.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD01 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO77	MR DARREN HOOLEY				Support	This site is ideally situated next to new and existing housing and is in a sustainable location, a short walk from Leek town centre and less than 200m from a bus stop. Development of this site will ease the pressure to build on more sensitive sites. Staffordshire highways have been consulted and raise no issues with the development of this site.	Support from the owner of the site noted.
PO1424	Mrs A Williams				Support	This site is ideal for both the school expansion and a new housing development. In addition the development of this site would reduce pressure to build on more sensitive sites elsewhere. The site is less than 200 metres from a bus stop and also a very short walk from the amenities of Leek which would restrict the need/use of vehicles.	Comments noted. The Council considers the sustainability/accessibility of all potential housing sites. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. If additional middle school space within Leek is required it is considered this site could be suitable to expand the existing Churnet View Middle School. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence and other studies. The Council must balance all relevant evidence when deciding over preferred allocations.

PO936 6	Mr David & Ros Barnes & Tyrrell				Object	Response form submitted [attached] that objects to proposed housing allocation at ADD01: access via Ball Haye Road already full to capacity any further development would worsen traffic levels The re-drafting of the town boundary to encompass ADD01 is taking away more greenfield site from the town perimeter, an unacceptable encroachment on public countryside there is a right of way to enable access for agricultural vehicles and livestock which runs across ADD01 from the track to Wardle Barn Farm to land owned by Horsecroft Farm. Question how will vehicles access land associated with Horsecroft Farm Nightingale Estate mostly unoccupied. This questions the need for further development in this area, particularly when open countryside is being used instead of the many brownfield sites.	The Council consults SCC Highways during every stage of Local Plan preparation; you can view their responses over proposed allocations on the Council's Site Allocations portal, including the 'Site Options Assessment' tables. They raise no objection to allocation of this site. In the event of development proposals upon this site, the Council would need to be satisfied that adequate and safe access to the public highway could be achieved and schemes having significant transport impacts would be assessed against relevant NPPF policy (including scope for contributions for highway improvements, where appropriate). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing (and education) requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. However this requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – the Local Plan explains how assumptions about future windfall housing are factored in (resulting in a lower requirement). However there is insufficient capacity to meet this requirement entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary alone resulting in proposed sites both within the urban area, and greenfield peripheral "urban extensions". The Council would ensure development proposals respect the routes of public rights of way; stating this in site allocations policies, where relevant. Local Plan Policy T2 supports and promotes the development of a network of safe walking, horse riding and cycling routes, linking communities and recreational/tourist areas; and requires that all legally recognised public rights of way affected by development are protected (or diverted where necessary) and, where possible, enhanced.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO115	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	No reason for new houses on green space that should be available for all to enjoy.	The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing (and education) requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. However this requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – The emerging Local Plan explains how assumptions about future windfall housing have been factored in (resulting in a lower requirement). However there is insufficient capacity to meet this requirement entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary alone resulting in proposed sites both within the urban area, and greenfield peripheral “urban extensions”. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of ‘Preferred’ allocation sites from wider sites including landscape impact evidence). The Council must balance all relevant evidence when deciding over preferred allocations. The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the emerging Local Plan. Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.
PO1679	Mr N A Brundrett				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. The grounds for that are:	See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1673	MRS A Staton					Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town.	
PO1649	Mrs G Webster					Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting.	
PO1643	Mrs J Lownds						The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the emerging Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1638	Mr W Johnson					Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1 st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of leek will become more common.	The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low-through to high- landscape sensitivity; also providing recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. Site LE022: the site fits well within the existing settlement pattern, as it is adjacent to existing development and enclosed by these tree belts to the south. Development of the site could potentially improve the approach to Leek on Ashbourne Road, as it could screen existing views of the service station to the north. <i>Site is of low landscape sensitivity.</i> Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022/LE127/LE128/LE140/LE142A/LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to
PO1667	Mr S Panek						
PO1661	Mr A Panek					Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking.	
PO1655	Miss J Panek						
PO4766	Mrs A Lomas					High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area. Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments proceed then the 500 houses would be constructed.	
PO4755	Mr & Mrs P & J Whitehurst					Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event.	
PO4750	Miss L Whitehurst					The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
PO1746	Mr Anthony Clark				Object LE142b, le142a, le140, Le128a, Le022, Le127 I write to object to the proposal to all the building of housed along mount road as set out in the preferred options doc. My 2 main objections are based on the implications for the environment and the traffic. Environment – For generations Mount Road has been a favourite walking/cycling/horse riding route for many residents of Leek. It is easily accessible (not requiring a car to reach it) and is quiet safe place by way which can be used by all people of all ages in all weathers. The major attraction is walkers are the outstanding vista the road provides both town and county. The proposed building at the north would destroy the turn the road into a noisy, busy thoroughfare, that would be unsafe and unpleasant for walkers and all over leisure users. The proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean the views of the town would be lost. At a time when all our members of society are being encouraged to take more exercise the destruction of the mount is free, natural gym, seems very short sighted. Immediate area Mount road is not a wide enough area to safely take a major increase in traffic. The existing access points to this area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are wholly inadequate and dangerous for the high volume of vehicles. If as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road causes minimal amount of problems. An increase in traffic will queues will lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Where will they go to do these activities? Traffic The consequences of the traffic of building many houses both in the immediate area and the town as whole will be very marked. Work Very few work in Buxton or Ashbourne which re easily accessible from the mount. The vast majority work in the town centre, the barn field's industrial estate or on Cheadle road. Those commuting out of the town centre will be heading mostly to stoke Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that the major building works to the east of leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging site LE142b and LE140. Is there not a possibility of the building on the site existing site of Kniveden Hall (which is screened of by	LE142b, le142a, le140, Le128a, Le022, Le127 I write to object to the proposal to all the building of housed along mount road as set out in the preferred options doc. My 2 main objections are based on the implications for the environment and the traffic. Environment – For generations Mount Road has been a favourite walking/cycling/horse riding route for many residents of Leek. It is easily accessible (not requiring a car to reach it) and is quiet safe place by way which can be used by all people of all ages in all weathers. The major attraction is walkers are the outstanding vista the road provides both town and county. The proposed building at the north would destroy the turn the road into a noisy, busy thoroughfare, that would be unsafe and unpleasant for walkers and all over leisure users. The proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean the views of the town would be lost. At a time when all our members of society are being encouraged to take more exercise the destruction of the mount is free, natural gym, seems very short sighted. Immediate area Mount road is not a wide enough area to safely take a major increase in traffic. The existing access points to this area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are wholly inadequate and dangerous for the high volume of vehicles. If as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road causes minimal amount of problems. An increase in traffic will queues will lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Where will they go to do these activities? Traffic The consequences of the traffic of building many houses both in the immediate area and the town as whole will be very marked. Work Very few work in Buxton or Ashbourne which re easily accessible from the mount. The vast majority work in the town centre, the barn field's industrial estate or on Cheadle road. Those commuting out of the town centre will be heading mostly to stoke Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that the major building works to the east of leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging site LE142b and LE140. Is there not a possibility of the building on the site existing site of Kniveden Hall (which is screened of by	See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access The Council's emerging Local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022/LE127/LE128/LE140/LE142A/LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The Preferred Options also set out the Council's proposals for additional retail floorspace, and employment land across the District, where there is an identified need for these. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence and a Green Belt Review. The western edge of Leek is covered by Green Belt (requiring more onerous justification to allocate compared

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						trees) and the old Social Services building? These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and still generate a lot more traffic throughout the town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway in a linear park (the high lane). Would that Leek had planners and leader of similar vision to develop mount road into a high lane for the benefit all off the community	to non-Green Belt land). The most recent 2016 landscape impact study concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low-through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. They concluded Site LE066: is located beyond the ridge of Mount Road, which currently screens views of Leek from the PDNP. The woodland within the site provides screening of existing development within Leek. Development within the site would be visually prominent and could potentially affect the setting of the PDNP. Site is of high landscape sensitivity. Note that landscape and Green Belt evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). Note that Kniveden Hall LE066, is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO1600	Mrs J Smith				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected	See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low-through to high- landscape sensitivity; also providing recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4824	Mrs L Scragg				Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways
PO9161	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: The Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area. If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road. If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Site LE022 was deemed mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of the species poor grassland area but has some fairly biodiverse areas connected by hedgerows to the south and north [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended]. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Note that landscape, ecology and Green Belt evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. • See para response to PO1746 about highways The Preferred Options also set out the Council's proposals for additional retail floorspace, and employment land across the District, where there is an identified need for these. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9076	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO9161 about western Green Belt
PO9085	Mr Simon Halliday	Eclipse Broadcast Ltd			Object	I'm writing to you to let you know about my concerns for the proposed house building scheme. I live [near] LE022, a small field which is earmarked for development. Our house is a little strange in that we only have a small front garden, and no windows on the rear, meaning our only outlook is on this field, which provides us with some privacy and a buffer from the main Ashbourne road. We derive a great deal of pleasure from our view, we also spend a lot of time watching birds in our garden, a large proportion of which live in the trees bordering the field. Theres also a few goats and pigs in the field, which are very popular with all the local residents, every day there are people feeding them, looking at them and bringing children to see them, my partner in particular has a great affinity with them, treating them like pets. We moved to this house from Ball Green where we were living in an estate, and have really enjoyed the quiet country aspect to the location. Another aspect to this is the top of Ashbourne Road where the field entrance is, is where the speed limit reduces from 50 to 30, meaning this is a fast section of road as cars either accelerate towards the 50 sign, or are still travelling at speed past the field. If this site is developed, it will make this section even more dangerous. If this site is developed, it means we will lose our privacy and our house/garden will be completely overlooked, we lose our view, noise levels will increase and the animals will have to either be moved or put down. We feel this will completely destroy our quality of life. [Photograph submitted showing the view out of rear garden to LE022].	The Council's design and amenity Policies and standards will be applied to subsequent planning schemes across allocated sites. • See para response to PO9161 on ecology evidence The ecological evidence deemed LE022 to be of 'local' importance only, and of low biodiversity value. • See para response to PO1746 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9129	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed. Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek in this issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period. • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1746 about additional retail and

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							employment land requirements See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public.
PO9402	Carla Hodgkinson				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are most of my family. I remember being taken for long walks as child, and now take my nephew for those same walks; only having so much more appreciation for the stunning views and wildlife to be found in this area. As an adult, I love going round the mount. I appreciate the openness, the air and the views and as I have grown up have learnt to value and cherish this local area. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, locals can walk their dog, go for a run or walk whilst savouring the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit 'The Potteries' or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short-term gain. As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land, before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken into deep consideration before this gem in	- See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO1746 about highways - See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9311	Ms Emily Hodgkinson						
PO9403	Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the town is lost forever.	
PO9192	Mrs M Motum				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. • See para response to PO1746 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9298	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence
PO9235	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water Im concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that Local Plan Policy will require that, wherever possible, development will promote the reduction of flood risk by the use of sustainable drainage techniques as per the Flood and Water Management Act., as well as taking opportunities to contribute to wider Council objectives such as its emerging Green infrastructure Network; to enhancing biodiversity and recreation opportunities etc.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE022 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	
PO9211	Mrs E Adams				Object	I wish to place my strong objections to the proposals to build house on the mount, leek. It would devastate this beautiful area which benefits tourists and residents alike. Objections also relate to roads, schools, doctors etc. Please please rethink your plans.	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements • See para response to PO9129 about infrastrure delivery plan
PO9178	Mrs E Adams				Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9249	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1679 about public rights of way • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1679 about streetlighting The Council must demonstrate to Planning inspector that it proposes to allocate sufficient land to meet its objectively assessed housing needs for the town. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO9086	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9375	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west side of Leek are developable.	• See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO9161 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO9121 about development capacity study The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. • See para response to PO9161 about western Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9092	Ms Sarah Bishop				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands" , Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"!	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9263	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as "Preferred Housing Allocation'. There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners.	1. See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence 2. See para response to PO1746 about highways 3. See para response in PO9235 about utilities and flood risk 4. See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access 5. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. • See para response to PO9161 about western Green Belt 6. See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance. 7. Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. 8. The Council would not seek to over-allocate. In any event, the property values are not a matter covered by the Planning Acts.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9170	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	- See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access The NPPF directs that where development is necessary, lower grade agricultural land be used ahead of higher grade. Note that the various site options around Leek appear to fall within the same ALC (Grade 4 'poor'). Agricultural land quality must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. - See para response to PO9263 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO1746 about additional retail and employment land requirements - See para response to PO1746 about highways - See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements The Council consults with service providers including Regional Clinical Commissioning Groups during Plan preparation; and is also preparing a Development Capacity Study, which considers the extent of public services across the District. Note that this evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. - See para response to PO9161 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9185	Ms Michele Rushton				Object	I wish to register my disapproval re the above development and quite the following points. Loss of an important local amenity – the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by people across the town. Visual impact - restricting important and highly valued panoramic views across the Leek skyline and further afield. Impact on infrastructure - primary schools in particular (East Street, Beresford) will struggle to keep up with demand and the situation where some children already have to travel to schools in the west of Leek will become more and more common Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging High quality landscape – unsympathetic to the landscape character and quality of the area Urbanisation of the country lane that is Mount Road – if all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The spatial distribution of proposed sites across Leek is unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event The volume and speed of traffic is likely to increase on Kniveden Lane where my family have been residents for over 25years. Please for the sake of Leek and her people, review your proposal.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1679 about streetlighting • See para response to PO1679 about public rights of way • See para response to PO1679 about viability study • See para response to PO1746 about highways
PO9217	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9277	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	a) The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. b) / d) • See para response to PO9263 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance c) See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence e) Each stage of Local Plan preparation must be agreed by Full Council Assembly. The Council must demonstrate to a Planning inspector that have produced a Local Plan preferably covering a 15-year time horizon, to take account of longer term requirements.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9320	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots IE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example,the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance,for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country " walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built . There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important , local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1746 about additional retail and employment land requirements • See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements All proposed sites in the Preferred Options consultation, will require approval from Government planning inspector following examination, before the Council can formally adopt them as part of its replacement Local Plan. • See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9329	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is an quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1746 about highways
PO9368	Councillor Rebecca Done				Object	On the proposed planning for the Mount in Leek..I do not agree with and my reasons are stated below: The Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by a lot of people across the town including myself. There will be a massive impact on infrastructure, I think primary schools in particular would suffer (East Street, Beresford) and will struggle to keep up with demand. Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging. If all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The proposed sites across Leek are unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO9129 about infrastrure delivery plan • See para response to PO1679 about educational requirements • See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1679 about viability study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9417	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	I am writing to make you aware of the concerns I have over the housing proposals for the Mount Road area, Leek, set out in Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Options and Development Boundaries Consultation. The consequence on traffic of building many houses in the Mount Road area will be very marked both in the immediate area and the town as a whole . Immediate area Mount Road is not wide enough to safely take a major increase in traffic. The road is very popular with walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Increased traffic will discourage such use and be a danger to those leisure users who do continue to use the road. The existing access points to the area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are woefully inadequate and dangerous for high volumes of vehicles. If, as is most likely ,Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road would be great. At present the limited amount of traffic means that the restricted visibility due to the trees on Ashbourne Road causes minimal problems. An increase in traffic queues would lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the consequent destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Question where will they go to do these two activities. Work Very few will work in Buxton or Ashbourne which are easily accessible from Mount Road. The vast majority will work in the town centre, the Barnfields industrial estate or on Cheadle Road. Those commuting out of town will be mostly heading for Stoke or Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the centre of town at least twice a day at peak times as there are no alternative routes they can use. Shopping To reach the two large supermarkets in Leek (Morrisons and Sainsbury's) residents of the Mount Road area would be forced, by the road system, to travel through the centre of town. Those shopping further afield will, in the main, be heading for Stoke and Macclesfield and again will need to travel through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that major building to the east of Leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the Mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging sites are LE142b and LE140. Question is there not a possibility of building on the existing sites of Kniveden Hall (which is well screened by trees) and the old Social Services site. These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and in town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway into an linear park (The High Line). Would that Leek had planners and leaders of similar vision to develop Mount Road into The High Lane for the benefit of all the community.	• See para response to PO1746 about highways • See para response to PO1746 about additional retail and employment land requirements • See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO9161 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1746 about Council's railway line protection policy • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9383	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	• See para response to P1600 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO9161 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1746 about highways An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. The Council consulted upon all potential sites (of a minimum size) deemed deliverable for housing, as part of the Site Options consultation in July 2015. The results of this consultation (including the call for sites), alongside other relevant evidence, has informed the subsequent Preferred Options. • See para response to PO115 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO9161 about western Green Belt
PO9409	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	• See para response to PO115 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	- See para response to PO1679 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). - See para response to PO1679 on highways - See para response to PO9129 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement - See para response to PO9263 about Leek employment land requirements

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE064 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO412	Mr David John Allen				General comment	Care needs to be given to number of properties and access to main road. Also, potential to flooding. Consider more linear development and the potential slight expansion of the development boundary for infill sites such as Highfield / Lowfield and around the cricket club should be added without encroaching the green belt.	Site ref LE064 was recently granted outline planning permission for 11x dwellings (SMD/2013/1201). Note that the applicant submitted a site-specific flood risk assessment; and the permission contained a number of conditions requiring flood measures be designed into the scheme, including sustainable drainage (SuDS). Any boundary alterations involving loss of Green Belt (even if just for infill) would require demonstration of exceptional circumstances to Planning Inspector. The NPPF allows for consideration of 'limited infilling' in villages and development proposals upon 'brownfield' sites, in the Green Belt.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO89	Mr Bill Reid				Object	This area is a most popular area for walkers, runners, drivers and strollers. It has been, for as long as I can remember, an area that provides views over Leek town and the surrounding area which cannot be equalled. It is a beautiful peaceful part of Leek which should not be spoilt by housing estates and the disruption that goes with it. The top of Kniveden Lane has a piece of unadopted road which deters motorists from using it as a thoroughfare and I am sure that this would become adopted if the proposed plans go ahead causing untold traffic, noise and pollution, as well as the dangers to residents from the traffic. There are many areas around Leek which would be far more suitable.	The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the emerging Local Plan. Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – explains how assumptions about future windfall housing have been factored in (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral “urban extensions” around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of ‘Preferred’ allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landspace impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. It concluded LE127 to be of high landscape sensitivity; development within the site would likely be visible from the PDNP and could therefore affect its setting. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects ‘Preferred’ sites. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022/LE127/LE128/LE140/LE142A/LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO116	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	New houses will spoil view for residents of Moorland Road Extra traffic will be using Mount Road which is very narrow in places Why can't old mills be converted for residential use?	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO384 PO191	Mrs Brenda pigott Mr John Pigott				Object	The following comments apply to three areas allocated for housing development on Mount Road: LE127, LE128a and LE142a The proposal to build in these three blocks along both sides of Mount Road should be removed as the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre and is a very popular route for walking with or without dogs, jogging and cycling. It is also on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk giving panoramic views over the centre of Leek and the hills beyond. The Mount is a very important local amenity which has been completely underestimated and its value not understood.. A local resident carried out a head count on Sun 8 th May between 0700 and 2000 and counted a total of 217 people using the road for recreation : 190 walkers (44 with dogs, 8 with prams), 12 cyclists, 12 joggers and 3 horse riders. These were not in organised groups but simply people enjoying the exercise, the views and the fresh air in a safe and sustainable way – no need to get the car out. If the developments proceed then inevitably Mount Road, which is now a country lane, would be widened and become a busy estate road and people would not want to use it for recreation. Instead of building along Mount Road, the brownfield sites and other sites within the town boundary should be developed first. These include the following sites which were shown on the original plans but now taken out : LE 219, LE220, LE070, LE073, LE067, LE147, LE037 and LE063. The release of brown field sites ahead of green field sites cannot be justified.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance (note sites LE219 /LE067/LE147/LE037A and LE063 would already be covered by this windfall allowance; and LE073 is now a residential commitment)
PO123 PO124	B & M Bentley B & M Bentley				Object	Urban extension for New Housing is opposed on Mount Road. The relevant issues are 1. Landscape & historic character 2. Health & quality of life 'The Mount' is a known cultural and unique feature for Leek folk and visitors gained over many generations. Offering: Visual beauty, health and community amenity. The many attractions of a 'trip around the mount' would be largely lost. These comments refer to LE127, LE128a and LE140.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access
PO226 PO231	Miss Alicia Guy Mr Daniel Frith				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also. It could bring house prices down as at the moment it is such a lovely peaceful area and this no doubt will change	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
PO256	Rachel Fairbanks				Object	This objection applies to proposed sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b. The Mount is a beautiful area and deserves to be protected from development. Many people from across Leek regularly use it for walking and enjoying the views of the surrounding moorland and hills - there is nowhere else like it in Leek, and it's important for towns to have such green areas that are easily accessible. Building the proposed number of houses	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						(or indeed any number of houses) along Mount Road would lead to the loss of a valued and much loved area of countryside and a loss of habitat for wildlife, not to mention the inevitable increase in traffic, pollution and litter. I also question what the projected number of required new houses for the Staffordshire Moorlands is based on. Does the area really need 6000 new houses? If recent articles in the Leek Post & Times are correct, there are already nearly 4000 houses in the Moorlands area that are for sale or lying empty. If new developments are required, brownfield sites should be redeveloped first such as the old army camp at Blackshaw Moor, the derelict mill on Mill Street, and the area next to Sainsbury's, the planning application for which was supposed to include provision for new houses. We can't keep building on fields and other green areas - we need to protect valuable spaces such as The Mount for future generations as once they've been built on, we'll never get them back.	ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. • See para response to PO89 on highways If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development. Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO222	Mr Andrew Bodiam				Object	Like many others I have enjoyed walking on the Mount for 12 years and the planned housing site allocations in this area will completely destroy one of Leek's most valuable assets. Just take a walk along Mount Road and imagine what it would be like with the planned housing in place. I appreciate the Governments requirements but I am far from convinced that Leek's rural countryside should be sacrificed to their cause when there are so many brown field sites available. Furthermore, Leek is not a commuter town and I wonder if there is really the demand for 600 houses especially when those that are for sale take forever to do so. I would therefore ask you to think again.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence
PO1012	Mrs Sue Paulukiewicz				Object	My objection is to the developments planned on The Mount. This is a local beauty spot, and the number of houses planned will significantly harm the environment and spoil what is for many a delightful spot for walking. The number of cars that such a development would add to an already congested town is also a significant concern. The access at either end of The Mount is poor, and without substantial road alterations, either end could not be used safely in such numbers. There are plenty of empty mills and business accommodation that could be earmarked for development, so please leave this greenfield site as what it should be.....green fields!	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO679	Andy McGraw				Object	Extension of the Town Boundary into the Natural Zone The following blocks identified as, potentially suitable housing sites, all appear to be outside the town boundary on the maps supplied by the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, on this second housing consultation June 2016 Block numbers; LE 127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a, LE142b All the above mentioned blocks are therefore proposed to be constructed on the Natural Zone land surrounding the town of Leek. Public Amenity The small narrow lane known as Mount Road which travels between the A53 Leek/ Buxton road and A523 Leek/ Ashbourne road along which the following blocks appear, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a, are used on a daily basis as a public amenity. The lane is constantly used by locals and visitors to walk, ride and enjoy the views in relative safety at present. If the proposed housing goes ahead, with the number of houses planned on these sites, this road will undoubtedly suffer a dramatic increase in the number of vehicles using it, by averaging 2 cars per household, thus reducing its safety and relative quiet enjoyment. The views over the town of Leek and its surrounding countryside will also be affected detrimentally. I also note that the lane is included as part of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks, advertised and mapped by the Ordnance Survey as a recreational path but not highlighted as such on the SMDC consultation map. Surely the increase in vehicular traffic would compromise this route. Other public rights of way, public footpaths, are either not shown or seem now to stop at the new	• Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • The consultation map is intended to depict summary information only; it does not for example illustrate public rights of way. • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						development. When I raised the question of this fact at consultation the officer was unable to answer my query. In these times of austerity and the constant cut backs to local government, areas of free enjoyment and recreational use which also merit health benefits need to be conserved. Wildlife Concerns The blocks shown as, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a are frequently used by several bird species, especially during the winter months, as important feeding grounds. Some of these bird species are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CA81) as Schedule 1 protected species, identified by BirdLife International as Globally Threatened species and are listed as Red List species of birds of conservation concern by organisations, the RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), the British Ornithologists Union, Natural England and the British Trust of Ornithology, to name a few. The birds in question are; Fieldfare Turdus pilaris, Schedule 1 W&CA 81 and Red List species Redwing Turdus iliacus, Schedule 1 W&CA81 and Red List Species Starling Sturnus vulgaris, Red List species The small block of land between blocks LE127 and LE128a is also important to wildlife in particular bird species. Although this land is not earmarked for development I feel that the disturbance of the development would compromise the species using it. This small wooded block is used during the winter months as an important winter roost for a small number of Raven Corus corax, a species again afforded a certain amount of protection. Species using this block to breed include, Little Owl Athene noctua, although not afforded any specific protection via acts of Parliament or listed as a concern yet, it is a species showing major decline, UK population estimated to be down by 24%, as highlighted by the RSPB breeding bird data 1995 – 2008. Great Spotted Woodpecker Dendrocopos major, Nuthatch Sitta europaea, are other examples of regular breeding species in this area. Due to disturbance I predict that many of these species will refrain from using this important area. Infrastructure As mentioned previously the numbers of new houses proposed in the areas of Mount Road and Thorncliffe Road, blocks LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, will put an enormous strain on the local infrastructure and road system. We all constantly experience the difficulties whilst travelling through the town of Leek caused by any one road closure. Both junctions from Mount Road can be difficult to negotiate now with the small amount of traffic using it with the A523 being particularly dangerous in its present form. Problems with access at both these junctions will be severely increased with the increased volume of traffic. At the original consultation July 2015 there was no mention of increasing employment opportunities even when the question was raised. I still feel that these concerns have yet to be addressed. It was implied but not	proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						confirmed that most of the individuals who would be residing in the new development would be commuter based, travelling to nearby cities to seek their employment. This surely is contrary to most local government policies that are tasked with reducing this activity to contribute towards climate change and global warming issues. These planned developments will also have a visual, probably a negative impact from the adjoining Peak District National Park as it will be observed from the iconic Roaches and the boundary road of Morridge. There seems to be little or no mention of the use of brown field sites throughout the proposal. With the relaxation of planning rules for developing these sites should the Council look to these sites first. Removing deteriorating buildings and areas within the town that look unsightly and replacing with new developments would surely enhance the town, and, as they are close to amenities within the town centre, reduce the need for occupants to use their motor vehicles on shopping trips or evening entertainment. There are also a number of old mills and factories within the existing town boundary that could and should be transformed and upgraded into apartment blocks, as they have in other towns and cities in the UK, which would save those buildings from further degradation, provide perfect housing within the town and help to keep the overall feel of the town and its history. Conclusion In conclusion it is my belief that the proposed development and size of that development will have a serious and negative impact on the market town of Leek and its Natural Zone boundary. As a society in general we are loosing touch with nature and the great outdoors. There are Government initiatives to reverse and combat this trend. Organisations, funded by the National Lottery, Government, County and Local councils including SMDC, are tasked to promote these initiatives assisting people to re-engage with nature. We are also constantly reminded these days of heath, well-being and mental heath issues that our society is increasingly subject too due to the pressures of our modern living and the need for places for people to unwind. With this in mind how can we justify increasing the urban zone into our countryside. We have a duty to protect iconic landscapes, open spaces and the biodiversity such as can be found within the Mount Road area for the future generations of this fantastic town, so that they too, can experience quiet and peaceful recreation as we have enjoyed over the years . Maybe the Officers involved in making the final decisions should take an early morning walk along the Mount Road to experience these quiet and peaceful surroundings with the only noise being provided by the local bird-life with their dawn chorus. Once we loose these areas they are lost forever.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO673	Mr Jonathan Hulme				Object	The mount is an important, free, extensively used recreation facility for Leek. The proximity of the mount to the town makes it easily accessible, providing a rural escape for walkers, cyclists, joggers and families alike. This invaluable resource contributes to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all who use it. The mount provides panoramic views of the town and surrounding moor land including the Roches, and housing developments should not encroach on this. The junctions with the A53 and the A523 are also quite dangerous and unsuited to large amounts of traffic. Some form of traffic management would need to be added to these junctions, increasing congestion in and around the town to even higher levels than currently (which is already too high!!). This deters visitors to the town, reducing the amount of tourist trade. The area is also important ecologically and accommodates a variety of species, some of which appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. This excessive allocation of sites appears to be national policy implemented at a local level without consideration of local needs and demographics. The infrastructure in the east of the town is insufficient to cope with a population influx. For instance, the schools and health facilities are already full. Housing development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in the town such as Davenport mill on Mill Street and the mill on Ashbourne Road. The developers who own these sites should be incentivised to commence development. Redevelop eyesores, don't diminish beauty spots.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response PO679 about identification of sites during 2015 and 2016 public consultations The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the emerging Local Plan. All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.
PO699	Mr John Burnett				Object	This existing field forms an intrinsic part of the open space known as the Mount. As such it provides views over the town out to the Macclesfield area and for users of the Mount affords an area of outstanding natural beauty. Building on this plot of land would severely restrict the views available and would mean that use of the Mount Road as an exercise and recreation facility would be severely restricted. I would also object based on my concerns that building in this location would have severe impact on both existing infrastructure including roads and schools and would affect the ground water run off causing issues in other areas of the town. Building on this land would demonstrably damage the aspirations of the local community and would have severe economic and environmental consequences - completely at odds with the objectives of the consultation.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response PO679 about identification of sites during 2015 and 2016 public consultations • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that subsequent development proposals would be required to integrate sustainable drainage features into layouts, as required by the Flood and Water Management Act.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend.
PO379	Mr Dennis Cartlidge				Object	Eighteen months ago I was a very active sporty person. I could provide a quite a long list of sporting activities I was involved with back then and found all them to be great 'stress-busters'. This changed around last year when I was struck down by a serious medical condition. I had to put all my previous activities to one side. Dealing with the condition also left me feeling stressed and depressed. I would have previously dealt with such issues through sport, but this option was no longer available to me. About the only thing I could still do was walk and one day a friend suggested I take a stroll up 'the mount'. Although I'd lived in Leek for nearly twenty years, I'm afraid I have to admit that I'd never been up there before so my friend had to give me directions. I am so glad I discovered 'the mount'. I take regular walks up there (4-5 times every week) and it really is no exaggeration on my part to say that it has been a real lifesaver for me. Not only as it given me a place where I can exercise, it's proximity to peaceful countryside has helped me to deal with the many worries I have about my current health. I've been a regular visitor the mount now for the last year or so (in all weathers) and I can honestly say that I have never been up there and not found myself in the company of fellow walkers, dog-walkers, runners, families out for a stroll and cyclists. It really does seem to be a special place for Leekensians and I can now fully understand why so many people value it as a local amenity. For many (including me) 'the mount' is a place where they can find superb views and a breath of country air, without the need to drive out into the Peaks or moorlands. I would like to emphasise that I am not a 'NIMBY'. I agree that there is a need for more accomodation locally. However, I cannot believe there are not more suitable and accessible potential sites that could be used in Leek. The scale of development also makes me think we could be stocking up potentially dangerous future traffic problems, regards access to both Ashbourne and Buxton Road. Before development is considered for such an iconic part of Leek's landscape heritage, surely it would make sense for the council to conduct a review of brownfield sites WITHIN Leek that could solve any housing needs. Some developers have already shown the way with the reuse of some of Leek's former mills, but even a layman (like me) can see that there are still many of these types of building that could still be utilised, for example: the huge mill on the Macclesfield Road. If the council was to conduct such a review, I am sure there would welcome feedback from a wide	- See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO89 on highways

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						range of constituents. In conclusion, I would like to emphasise how many I value Leek's 'green lung'. I know I not alone in hoping this great public amenity can be saved. I hope the council will see sense and review it's existing plans as soon as possible.	
PO466	Mr Richard Wagstaff				Object	I am appalled at your decision to earmark the Mount as a preferred option. The road is used by, and has been used by many people of the town over the years as a beautiful leisurely walk in the countryside with remarkable views over Leek. We have unprecedented views all around Leek. The Roaches, Hillswood, Shutlingslow, Bosley Cloud, Ladderedge etc which will be lost for ever if this land is developed. We cannot allow such an invasion to happen. Apart from the desecration you have to consider the road junctions at both ends, Buxton Rd and Ashbourne Rd. These are dangerous now so what will it be like when vehicles from 400 houses occur. This area must be deleted from the plan	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1324	Mr Stapleton	Leek And District Civic Society			Object	I write on behalf of Leek & District Civic Society to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision to include The Mount Leek as a preferred option for housing development. This area is heavily used by recreational walkers and is the sort of local amenity which would be absolutely spoilt by additional building. Leek has few enough open spaces as it is and the loss of The Mount would be completely unjustifiable. Of all the site options in the Leek area, The Mount is the one which we feel should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected for the present populace and future generations.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1353	Mr A Birks				Object	This morning whilst taking my constitutional stroll around mount road I happened upon a group of people considering the best plots to build houses in this beauty spot. One member of the group introduced herself as a local councillor. My heart sank as it became clear that some minds at least, against the wishes of the local people, the decision to build seems to have been taken. It is outrageous that the local community is once again to be ignored by those elected to serve us. Mount Road is a very important part of the social scene of Leek as local people use it daily to enjoy the countryside which is within their homes. It would be an ecological and social outrage to remove this facility from the people of Leek. This area is more important to the wellbeing of residents from across the town than any other area around leek as it is their gateway to a relaxed walk in the fresh air in the countryside. Any development of this area would change the nature of Leek as it would necessitate the widening of the road, the installation of lighting and the uprooting of that special commodity trees. The Mount Road would be a major thoroughfare between the Ashbourne Road, and Buxton Road, Kniveden Lane Would be a conduit between the same roads meaning heavy traffic rushing through the estate and there would be a problems caused by necessary construction of major road junctions at each end of the Mount Road. Local residents this would be a disaster. There is a concern too that, with the addition of a large number of houses in this area, the infrastructure at this end of town would be challenged beyond its ability to cope. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very full and recent queues of vehicles to get into town were horrendous during the roadworks in the town. Imagine the chaos should we add another 500 families in the queue. In the unlikely event that Leek should actually need extra accommodation, consideration should be given to brownfields or less intrusive sites first. There are several derelict mills which could be utilised for apartments or demolished for housing. The infrastructure of drains, electricity and gas is readily available near these 2 areas too. I appeal to the council to reflect on the wishes of those who elected them to serve their needs and reject the idea of developing this area and retain it for enjoyment and health of the many people of leek who appreciate it.	The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. • See para response to PO5884 about tree protection • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1145	Mr R Harrison				Object	I have recently looked at the site plans and talked to one of your officers concerning the location: This is a narrow road, used by many recreational purposes such as walking, cycling The views over Leek Conservation area and its surrounding area are 2nd to none both night and day There have been lots of houses built on the east side of Leek in recent years mainly off Ashbourne road. As the majority of people travel to Macclesfield, Manchester and Stoke on Trent to work, this means they have to travel through the centre and often Leek is gridlocked at busy times The exits from the Mount onto Buxton and the Ashbourne Roads are both very narrow and difficult to negotiate. Schools at the end of the town are already full to capacity and young children have to be taken across Leek early in the morning and collected in the evening. Drs Lists are so full. We are told that some of these houses are possible affordable housing. What does this mean? There are plenty of small terrace houses on the market which I would consider as affordable. So do we need more? In fact do we need a 1000 new houses to be in Leek at all anywhere? If so I would like to think that there are possible sites in Leek - West End could be given consideration before further action is taken. Leek is a beautiful small town with easy access to countryside. By allowing building on The Mount Road that access will be diminished as more of our green fields turned into housing developments and country roads become clogged with vehicles. Where will it end?	- See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 on highways - See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal - See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO673 about educational requirements The Council consults with its Housing Officer when setting definitions of 'affordable' in relation to affordable housing. This usually equates to a percentage of open market value which represents the upper limit that the house can be sold/resold for. - See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt
PO930	Mr Chris Clark				Object	Building houses adjacent to Mount Road would permanently destroy the panoramic view of Leek from this location. Mount Road is used every day by walkers, with easy access to those living towards the north and east of the town. If houses were to be built in this location, most occupants would have employment in Stoke-on-Trent (or Macclesfield) and would therefore add to the already congested traffic through the town	- See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1681	Mr N A Brundrett				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B.	- See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO1353 about streetlighting - See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO1674	MRS A Staton					The grounds for that are: Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town.	
PO1650	Mrs G Webster					Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting.	
PO9369	Councillor Rebecca Done					High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area.	
PO9256	Mrs Jane Harrison					Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO897	Miss Christina Lunn					demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of leek will become more common.	• See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO89 on highways The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites. • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO4767	Mrs A Lomas					Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking.	
PO1644	Mrs J Lownds					Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments proceed then the 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event.	
PO1668	Mr S Panek					Traffic & congestion through & around Leek is already critical without the addition of more vehicles.	
PO1662	Mr A Panek					Noise pollution, air pollution - a potential 1000 new cars. Light pollution from a new sprawling estate.	
PO1656	Miss J Panek					The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	
PO4746	Mr & Mrs P & J Whitehurst					Question where are the jobs to support people buying new houses	
PO4751	Miss L Whitehurst					Question why can't brownfield sites/old mills etc be converted to housing · I chose to live near Mount Road because I like it as it is, please do not change it!	
PO9186	Ms Michele Rushton						
PO1580	Mr PJ Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount. It is a icon beauty spot, Leek's gateway into the open country side and has been popular with walkers, joggers, cyclist and horse riding for generations and should be protected for future generations to I strongly recommend further consideration be given to the developing the empty mills, brownfield Sites and making use of the many vacant homes in the Moorlands before surrendering our precious Greenfields to hungry developers.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1701	Mr Michael Owen				Object	My wife and I would like to tender our personal objections to any proposed house building along Mount Road Leek. We don't feel that the area has infrastructure to cope with the number of houses proposed and would spoil the landscape of a very popular and picturesque area used extensively by Leek residents	• See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 about open

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							spaces and countryside access See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO1689	Mr David Morgan				Object	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to build houses on the Mount. I specifically object to the building off houses on sites: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. When I first heard about the proposal to build in this area. I was genuinely shocked and still cannot believe that the proposal have been submitted to build on such beautiful landscape which has helped to shape leeks identity as Queen Of the moorlands. I work in the local community and I have not heard a single resident of Leek express support for these proposals – they have expressed deep anger and concern. I live locally to the Mount and regularly take walks there and it is very clearly, a popular destination for walkers and cyclist. However, I do not feel that this is area that is solely of Leek by these who live in its vicinity. I believe that the mount is an area that the people of Leek genuinely cherish and it would be a tragedy if a major housing development were built along it, The Mount does provide an important amenity for local residents including Hargate estate. I feel it would be unacceptable to build houses on it, spoiling the unspoilt beauty of the area and leading to a huge increase in the traffic which would obviously cause a major hazard to walkers and cyclist. I feel it is unacceptable to deprive residents of a very built up area such as Haregate estate of the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful country side and open space this that the mount offers. If this proposal is passed then I feel that the character and identity of Leek will be very adversely affected and this will have a very detrimental impact on its image in terms of visitors and attracting business	- See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 on highways - See para response to PO699 about economic benefits of housebuilding

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1284	Mrs B Ward				Object	I write once again to protest against the proposed development of housing along and off mount road. We have already had 2 public enquires and each time the inspector has upheld the decision not to allow these fields to develop along mount road. This is a great amenity for the town, especially for residents this side of Leek. I feel that we have been left a short stretch off mount road but with all the roads going off it Mount Road itself will probably have to be widened and will become a bi pass for traffic between Buxton Road. Walking along a country lane enjoying the views. Do people walk as much on the other side of town? Aren't there still places for the development within the town? Not touching our open spaces. Where are 600 new houses on Mount Road going to work?	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1405	Mrs M Smith				Object	With regard to the proposed 400 plus houses to be built on the mount, I would like to express my concerns on the matter. I can't help but for see the problems 400 to 800 cars will create, trying to leave Mount Road to gain access to the Buxton Road. They will be queuing up! Most families these days have at least one car some have two. Mount Road was not built for such traffic	• See para response to PO89 on highways
PO1483	Mrs C Lane				Object	I object to any housing being built in this area. It is an area used by many people for walking etc. – many for health reasons e.g. for me. We must keep our open spaces that are in walking distance of our town, once lost – gone forever. Don't let us loose it	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1714	Mr G Carding				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on Mount Road Leek. The Mount has been a historic to the people of Leek for generations for its 360 degree panoramic views of natural beauty. Being born in Leek I have walked over the mount all my life and always enjoyed the peace and quiet surrounded by the countryside views which are irreplaceable building housing in this area would also destroy the wildlife and a result in the loss of open space. This road is unsuitable for the large volume of traffic which would be generated by all the new houses and is narrow in places with dangerous junctions at both end of the road. The roads in this part cannot take any more traffic. Please find more suitable site within the town, if we keep building out into the countryside where will the border of Leek End? Ashbourne	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1997	Mr D And L Robinson				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a Central Government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself is the site allocated off Mount Road, Leek. At present most of the estates west of Mount Road are below the crest of the Mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of High View Road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along High View Road and Moorland Road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the Town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the Southern and Western flank of Leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the Mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period. However irrespective of this the Council must demonstrate to Government Inspector that it will fully meet residual housing and employment requirements for the District as a whole, and for Leek, to have a sound Local Plan in place. • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1353 about streetlighting • See para response to PO89 on highways (these comments are predicated on a Mount Road access arrangement) The Council would assess residential schemes in proximity to approved wind turbines in accordance with Local Plan and NPPF amenity Policies, and ETSU (as amended) noise criteria etc. • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response in PO699 about utilities and flood risk
PO1991	Mr M Turnock						
PO2011	Miss CM Hambleton						
PO2019	Mr RP kerr						
PO4737	Mr W Trafford						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1732	Mrs Mary Emery				Object	LE066, LE067, LE068, LE143a, LE127, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of the land on The Mount My reasons are as follows. There are sufficient brown field site available, such as The former Just juice site on Prince Street is now vacant The former Big Mill on Mill Street, ripe for development The former Brough, Nicolson and Hall Mill on Ashbourne Road A reasonable plot of land on the Organ Ground which was the former East Street Nursery which is now vacant. Shortly to become available the former Britannia Building Society plot of land on Cheddleton Road Land on Foker Grange on Macclesfield road The Mount is a valued area of outstanding beauty and must be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is supposed to be green belt land; consideration that seems to have been overlooked. I would like to point out the impact of the proposed development would have on local services i.e. schools, GP services, the road infrastructure and employment needs. I am also very concerned about the effect on the local wildlife,, the increase in traffic, and noise levels this development will bring. I would like to know what happened to the housing development at the Sainsbury's site, which never seems to have transpired	- See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Residential schemes within the urban area involving employment land or buildings not allocated for housing, would be assessed against Core Strategy Pol E2, and other relevant Core Strategy and NPPF policies The former Britannia premises on Cheddleton Road are earmarked for two sites for mixed alternative uses (LE150 and LE235), in response to the town's residual employment land requirements to 2031 [see table 4.4 consultation document]. Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt. - See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO673 about educational requirements - See para response to PO89 on highways - See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence - See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development Part of the Sainsburys site attracted reserved matters approval for 39 dwellings as part of SMD/2013/1098.
PO1722	Mr & Mrs V and J Emery						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1750	Mr and Mrs W Lovatt				Object	LE069, LE143a, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. We would like to submit our comments concerning the above consultations with the specific regard to Leek east. These consultations with specific regard to Leek East and the area of mount road. This is a semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of the attractions of this area of Leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10minutes walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking jogging and cycling. This is a important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to a nature very close to the heart of leek. The views from the mount are spectacular and largely unspoilt. Any developments of any of all the listed developments of the type proposed would totally alter the area, as it has with the Buxton Road end of Mount road. If all the development listed above were to proceed. In excess 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development especially on the bad junction where mount road meets Ashbourne road near Poplar Service Station.. Access via the already existing estate off kniveden lane and or High View road and Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature off the roads in question and the cars parked on either side of the roads in what is a already busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious consequences Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land that would be ideal for development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development would be ideal of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities and would be more sustainable as they would result from a increase in traffic in outlying areas. Given to the employment situation in Leek, a large proportion of these would inevitably be homes for communities for the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would ruin the character and community feel of the area. Given the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable housing in rural locations, more consideration should be given this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this town.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways Leek is already served by a number of frequent or less frequent bus routes, connecting to centres such as Hanley, Cheadle, Buxton and Macclesfield. A number of these use main arterial routes such as Buxton Road/Ashbourne/Springfield Road. In some circumstances, major residential developments may be required to contribute to improved bus routes/bus facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Pol T1/Staffordshire Local Transport Plan. • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing.
PO1772	Mr S Lovatt						
PO1757	Mrs J Lovatt						
PO3641	Mr and Mrs Jones						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1474	Mrs G Armstrong				Object	As a resident of Moorland Road since 1975, I write to you to express my concerns over the appalling plan to yet again to destroy an area of the town much loved and frequented by its residents for countless generations. I can assure you that the contents of the letter not only reflect the views of me and the residents of moorland road and Kniveden Lane but those of Leek in general. The proposal to build 400 houses on the Mount came as a shock to the town. Whilst I am not opposed to the idea of providing some housing In the Leek area, I cannot equate with the requirement for the number your department are planning. As regards the location, how can you say that a beautiful location like the Mount is in need of development when there are numerous locations that in the area that are an eyesore and would be more than fit the bill for re development? If your department were to take the time too canvas the people of leek you would find that it is considered an asset to this town. The Mount is an area of outstanding rural beauty with great views across the town, supporting an abundance of wildlife whose habitat would be destroyed if the plan goes ahead. It has long been a source of relaxation, leisure, exercise, and even welcomes retreats for courting couples and families with children or people exercising their pets can be seen walking the Mount in complete safety without the fear of being subjected to danger from large numbers of cars. This would change if the whole scheme goes ahead. Is it right that future generations should be denied the pleasure their forebears derived from this beautiful road, With an average of each household owning 2 cars each the pain to build 400 residents could unleash about 800 vehicles all trying to support those numbers. Mount road would be saturated with vehicles al trying to leave either via the junction with the A523 Ashbourne Road or the A53 Buxton Road. Both roads are very busy main roads. After frustration of accessing these knock on effect would choke the town centre which struggles now at certain times to maintain a smooth flow. No doubt the un adapted and unmade section of Kniveden Lane would be upgraded encouraging it to be used as a short cut between Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road. The only thing that stops it being a rat track now is that it is unmade and has ruts and pot holes. Also of concern is that with this sort of development you re require to provide a proportion for social housing. We all know who are housed in these and what effect it has on the surrounding area. I need say no more. Can you explain why there seems determination within the planning bodies to destroy what is beautiful and precious to the people of Leek with total disregard to the preservation of the environment and wishes of the Leek populace. If they want to improve this town why don't they concentrate on some off those areas in dire need of redevelopment and of which there are many in this town. I along with the majority of the other house owners in the vicinity, share at the lack of the thought the has obviously not being thought that has gone into this project. I ask the question; have any of the councillors or those on the planning dep actually	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response PO679 about identification of sites during 2015 and 2016 public consultations • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						bothered to walk to location, to see for themselves what they would be destroying and ask residents for their thoughts. No, I doubt it very much if this is the case. Is it just a figure on the map to them? I understand that the majority are not from Leek and so don't really have its best interests at heart. These so called councillors were voted in to represent the towns folk and listen to their view. This has not obviously been thought out thoroughly and it makes me wonder what sort of people will be running the council. Is it yet again something to their advantage and not that of the town. Their priorities do not appear to be the people of Leek there to represent them. I make this representation not only on behalf of those directly affected but also the people of Leek who are totally opposed to this desecration of one of the most beautiful and well-loved areas.	
PO1520	Ms Angie Guest				Object	Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of Leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1690	Mrs C Wainscott				Object	We write to reinforce grave concerns regarding the development of these 2 sites. LE127 and LE128a Firstly our primary objection to these 2 sites being development for housing is the impact of the traffic movements along mount road which would inevitably result. We have been residents on Mount Road for 47 years and during that time I have seen a significant increase in the usage of this road which has become somewhat of a rat run linking the main A53 Leek to Buxton Road with the A523 to Ashbourne Road. It hardly needs us to remind the local authority of the tragic road traffic accident a few years ago and this resulted in loss of life of a pedestrian following a collision with a vehicle and the regular use on the roads for recreational walks by many residents of leek coupled with preposterous 60mph speed limit already creates a recipe for further incidents. Further to the junctions connecting mount road to the A53 and A523 are already of poor standard with limited visibility when emerging particularly onto the A53 opposite novi lane. Secondly the area of Mount Road currently provides a buffer between existing development and open countryside and valuable interface between the 2, which is conveniently located to provide a much enjoyed amenity to many local amenities to many local residents who enjoy the tranquillity of the area for its beauty. From the planning policy perspective we understand that Governmental priority is given to brownfield site for future development and as Leek still exhibits the remnants of its industrial past with numerous redundant mills and industrial site still undeveloped it is hard to fathom how the logic that suggests the prominent greenfield site on mount road adjacent to open countryside should be developed in preference to multiple redundant industrial site in the area could ever be defended. We respectfully request therefore that the above concerns are considered by the local authority when deciding on the appropriateness for housing development of sites LE127 and LE128a for inclusion in the emerging SMDC local plans	• See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1561	Miss A Hampson				Object	Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in Leek	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1569	Miss L Sheldon				Object	I wish to object the proposed development on Mount Road for the following reasons: Serious damage to the natural habitat of endangered wildlife changing the entire environment forever. Increase traffic would cause major traffic issues not only cause major issues on the Mount itself but having a knock on effect on the town where congestion is already a issues. For generations the Mount has been a popular venue for walker's biker's families in general. It has provided a safe and pleasant environment and giving access to some of the finest views across Leek and Staffordshire Moorlands.	• See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1557	Mrs G Webster				Object	I have never protested before but I feel compelled to write this let reg the proposed developments across the mount. When I was young I lived on Haregate Est and many times my parents took my siblings and I across the mount it was something we enjoyed seeing all the farm animal and wildlife. As I got older I would still walk the mount and dream of one day owning one of the houses which were only a couple of minutes' walk away from being in the countryside. That dream was realised in 1976. Now I am retired it is wonderful to be able to stroll round the mount each day. My husband twice a day come rain or shine, and able to do just that take in the views or have conversations with people we meet, not just from this area but from other parts of town. It is good for the soul as well as the mind. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is precious and should be protected for future generations 'never know what you have got till it's gone' comes to mind as was the case with what was a beautiful roundabout which stood proud at the top off Derby St. Do we need so many more houses in leek if so we do not build on the field opposite the cricket club on Macclesfield Road which would not have the catastrophic impact of hundreds of houses on the mount or why not build them on Blackshaw Moor where there is already a small estate. I hope this marvellous asset treasured by so many can be saved for the town and the people of Leek.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.
PO1549	Mr P Sinclair				Object	Would like to object to the development of the 350+homes on sites across the Mount. The area is used by lots of people walkers, families with young and older children dog walkers, cyclist, runners, horse riders, all enjoying the wonderful views over the Leek, which has been enjoyed for many years. I've been coming around the mount since I moved to leek in the late 60's, building more houses will mean the loss of this lovely scenery for ever. Also the health & safety factors of all these extra cars 600-700 trying to get out at either end of the mount, onto the Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road which is already busy without adding additional traffic. Then pollution of the air	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1538	Mrs C Whitehurst				Object	I am disappointed that local objections to development along Mount Road leek have been ignored by those who claim to represent us, and I must once again voice my objections. The Mount is one of our most beautiful and well-loved amenities for local walkers, cyclist, runners and dog walkers. A short walk from town which I personally use at least 3 times a week whenever I walk around I meet at least 10-12 others. It is also a safe route to take children of all ages to appreciate the country side, farm use and wonderful views – all of which will disappear. Many habitants for small animals and birds will go along the grass verges and lost trees, so much for our greener landscapes. Who is going to buy these obviously very expensive houses not my children who can hardly afford to rent never mind buy? But I'm sure the overspill from Macclesfield, Manchester + Buxton will appreciate these cheaper houses than they can afford there. Where will all the children go to school our local ones are full and have little or no space to expand, more Drs and Dentists will be needed. Traffic along the mount will be busy. It has already increased during times of the road closures repairs etc, and now this new short out has been found it will continue to be used. As there are now plans in place to convert several old apartments such as old Mills in the town a large number of houses will not be needed by local people and smaller brown field sites can be found in and around leek for a much more acceptable amount rather than such a large estate. If the £1000 per house built is so tempting why not just ask us for more council tax – I'm sure most people would be willing to pay to save this precious area for our children and grandchildren. I would. Please please listen to our objections regarding this atrocity in our wonderful town.	• See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements
PO1547 PO1542	Mrs C Keates Mr B Day				Object	The Mount is a very important area for the town of Leek. This whole area is an important amenity area for the town – it was promised a few years ago that there will be no further development after the completion of Mountside gardens. Further developments will destroy the open views of the Morridge from the town. Some of the areas highlighted for development was gifted to the town presumably to protect them and for agricultural use. Development of the Mount will lead to greatly increased traffic on what is basically a country lane. Safety issues at both junctions. The importance of the local people who use it. Young walkers, runners, joggers, cyclist, horse riding, dog walkers. These include singles, couple. Family groups and organised walking groups aside. We urge you to look at these plans very carefully before you decide to ruin this beautiful area. Surely there are other smaller areas which could be utilized for future needs.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. • See para response to PO89 on highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1492	Ms Dawn Garrett				Object	I write with reference to the planning proposals along The Mount in Leek. I moved to Leek last August, the countryside being one of the big draws. I'm dismayed to find that my favourite dog walk is earmarked for extensive development. The absolutely magnificent views would be lost forever. The birdsong drowned out by the inevitable increased traffic load. The wildflowers at the side of the road and the sheep peacefully grazing, all gone. The creeping urbanisation of such a lovely country town is a big worry. Surely it would be better environmental sense to deal with the falling-down mills and derelict housing in the town before building any further? Regeneration is a much more modern concept and would further revitalise the town itself. For me and my family access to the views, the fresh air and the wildlife is balm against our stressful and hectic working lives. I live on Ashbourne Road so this is not NIMBYism at work, it is a genuine plea to save this lovely area for everyone. Now and in the future.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1581	Mr C Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I love to go running there with my dad and really enjoy the view into open countryside.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO1586	Mr J Jones				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO1591	Mr L Emerick				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected. My family often take our dog for walks there and feel it should be protected	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO1596	Mrs J Smith				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO1601	Mr J Mays-Woodhead				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1692	Ms K Machin				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on the mount road, leek as outlined in the preferred options site and boundaries of staffs moorlands local plans – sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. This area should not be built on as it will ruin the lovely views over Leek and the Horizon and has been enjoyed for generations by walker's cyclist etc, who on a nice day vastly outnumber cars on this stretch of road. This road also appears to be outside the site boundary. By building approx. 400 houses it will no longer be a country walk yet another housing est. The council should be committed to maintaining green belt land and encouraging people to get fresh air and exercise in an age increasing obesity. There are surely plenty of empty mills and brownfield or former industrial sites within the town which could be developed for housing instead of building on open fields. There is also no development proposed in the west end of leek-why not? The planners need to go back to their drawing board and identify more suitable sites across the whole leek instead of concentrating on the one unsuitable area. Please save the mount	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt
PO1706	Mr C Hoggarth				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A I am writing to you with regards to you with my objection to the proposed sites above for housing development that I consider will result in loss of countryside e an recreational amenity to local residents. My objections consist of 3 main concerns: The loss of green field sites. The enclosure of the open space that is mount road. The loss of recreational amenity of Mount Road through the amount of additional traffic. The areas of land in question is border Mount Road, a low traffic route with broad open views across countryside to the east over the town of Leek and beyond to its west. Mount Road well known locally for the pleasurable route for exercise it provides and is much used by local residents and visitors. Enclosure with housing development would turn an open country lane into just another urban roadway and would destroy the views reducing the attraction of the area. The associated increase in the traffic would severely reduce the safety route. I consider that the cumulative effect would be to destroy the area as a recreational amenity. Of the area surrounding the current town boundaries, I think that this is one that would constitute the greatest loss, both with respect to the beauty of the outlook and the loss of its use for recreation. Mount Road is a beautiful location; visitors jealously comment how lucky I am to have such an area on my doorstep. To destroy it would be a disgrace and I hope you will reconsider the proposals	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1705	Mrs J McGuiness				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A. As a local resident in objection to the above proposed plans For the Mount in Leek. I object to the scale of development for this beautiful country lane on the outskirts of our town. It is a area of outstanding beauty, boasting much wildlife, flora and fauna. The woodland and hedgerows are home to valued wildlife and birds. In addition there are farm animals, bats, foxes, stoats, mice all of which inhabit this area has been identified over existing brownfield sites in town. Could the planners not relax the rules and allow sites in town that have been previously been refused for development? Do we really need 400 houses? Do we really need another 1 st school, at this end of the town? I am dubious as there are as many properties in the town already for sale, unoccupied or derelict. Where are all the people coming from to buy these 400 houses? My main objection is the sheer volume of traffic. The roads are totally unsuitable to accommodate the amount of traffic that's will be generated by a school and 400 houses. This development has the potential to create at least 800 cars from the proposed housing development (average 2 cars per house hold) and even more generated from schools with staff and pupils, including the cars school buses . The lane is already suffers from many vehicles using the lane, as a rat run and this will increase. In addition to being a resident The Mount I am also a daily dog walker and I am concerned for the safety of those using the lane for leisure, i.e walker, dog walkers, joggers, mums with little ones, cyclists, horse riders and those coming to sit on the seats provided to take in the beautiful views. If development goes ahead these activities will come to an end and once again our green landscape will disappear with the town boundaries being pushed out further and further. Where will local people be able to go without getting into these cars and causing more traffic congestion on the roads, and what about those without transport? The road junction at either end of the Mount are not without difficulties. The Buxton Road junctions Is a staggered cross roads with Novi Lane and needs to be approached with caution. At school times It is used by parents/carers/school buses. I cannot imagine the chaos that will transpire if another school is permitted on the Mount – it will certainly become a lot busier and more dangerous. Do we really want to put our children at risk? Walking to and from school will not be a solution as it will be to dangerous. Let us not forget that in additions to this road junction, a short distance down the same road Churnet View transport comes onto the Buxton Road via Abbotts Road, and Leek High/The Meadows/East St 1 st School all feed into and use Buxton Road via Springfield Road. Each school has buses/taxis and cars transporting pupils and the volume using the roads at the same time of day has potential to cause bottle necks on this busy main road. Another school shall mean 7 school all using the same road – local residents will have to keep of the road to the volume of traffic down. The other end of the mount leads to Ashbourne road and this junction not only has obscured visual	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						access but a difficult angled junction. Surely this is totally unsuitable to transport large volumes of traffic which will be generated from 400 houses and a school! If a alternative junction is proposed this can only be achieved by sacrificing another green field. The Mount, Ashbourne Road are all used by big lorries, buses, tractors, trailers, farm stock to and from stock market, farm machinery, lorries transporting goods to and from Buxton, Ashbourne, and Surrounding areas. These are very busy roads! Can we really add to this without causing major problems? I urge the council to consider these proposals very carefully giving due time and consideration to alternative sites in town, because once the boxes are ticked it will be irreversible and the mount will be changed forever.	
PO1738	Mr Martin Armstrong				Object	LE127, LE128A, LE142A, LE142B Why turn a place of beauty into an eyesore when the council should be concentrating on transforming areas which are an eyesore into places of beauty. There are so many alternatives to the proposed sites for housing development around leek is without having to take away Leeks most cherished leisure route. Mount Road has long been a source of relaxation, leisure and exercise to the residents of Leek It is used daily by scores of locals who walk, run, cycle, and enjoy the tranquillity of this country lane which provides fantastic views across Leek and towards the peak district. Where else in the area is there such an amenity so conveniently within walking distance and safe for people to enjoy. The Mount is also a natural habitat for wildlife including many endangered species. The like of owls, woodpeckers and many more other birds and small mammals would be severely put to risk and their habitat will be seriously damaged. This proposed totally unnecessary housing development would not only destroy all this but also a place extra stress on the town centre already, struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra stress owns the town struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra vehicles would adversely affect road safety and be a danger to the public particularly on both exits from Mount Road. These are but a few of the issues generated by this ill thought out scheme	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways
PO2905	James Chadwick	Stafford shire County Council			General comment	The allocations proposed around Mount Road will necessitate highway improvements for example road widening, provision of footways, completing Kniveden Lane to adoptable standard, possible (probable) junction improvements at one or both ends. The removal of the sites between LE127 and LE128a could make the delivery of the required scheme more complicated and therefore requires further consideration including the reinstatement of sites LE069 & LE128b.	The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3658	Mr P Ash				Object	My husband and I most strongly oppose the number of sites on Mount Road, Leek as preferred option for new homes. Both of us have lived in Leek all our lives and for the past 50 years have resided on the Moorland Road. Mount Road is acknowledged as an area of open space for walking, cycling, and jogging and it is a area of free from volumes of traffic? I know my mother exercised, pushing me in my pram walking round the Mount. Building houses either side of the road would most likely make the Mount Road into a main road linking Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road. This road is not sustainable not wide enough to take heavy vehicles and constant stream of Traffic, if numerous houses were to be built either side for Health and Safety reason would require pavements, gutters and drainage all of which will narrow, the width of the road for vehicles, in all probability each house will have 2 cars, which again will increase the flow of traffic. To surface the top of Kniveden lane would make this road a rat race and a highway leading to an increase of even more traffic may I remind the council that when the developers applied for planning permission to build homes on the land behind sunny view at the end of Ashbourne Road – grave concern was exposed by Staffordshire County Council of traffic from the houses converging onto a busy main road, would that not also apply to traffic from the houses converging onto 2 main roads – Ashbourne road,, and at the other end of Buxton road. I would like to draw your attention to the fact when Mr William Milnes gave the land he owned to the council, land where now stands Leek High School, and is playing fields which borders Kniveden Lane and extend on the Mount, there was a clause in the gift of land that this land would be only used for educational purposes. One may also ask the council “where are all families and buyers that require these houses? Leek has not the facilities to accommodate such a huge increase in its population. The Dr's are already working to their full capacity, which schools primary and senior have places for an increase in children of school age? And where will the new comers to the area, travelling from the Mount to Macclesfield or to the potteries will increase the flow of traffic though the centre of the town these were problems with planning permission to build house on ?? At Leek brook on the site of Joshua Wardens factory, as to the nature of the ground and the fact the earth may have become contaminated from factory work etc. These problems were overcome and rectified and houses were built. Now houses cannot build on this land surrounding Sainsbury's Supermarket because of problems with the land – if land at Leekbrook can overcome the problems with the land around Sainsbury's overcome the problem? And houses can be built on land previously occupied and accommodating buildings.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways The Council is not aware of any legal encumbrances upon this site. • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme (subject to conditions). The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer. • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3692	Mrs C Ryan				Object	I am writing to express my objection to recently published plans to build on a large area of the Mount in Leek. Whilst understanding there is a need for some new housing, I feel this area is the wrong place and definitely too extensive. A few points I would like to share which may not take into account the professional opinion but a certainly take a common sense view. The Sainsbury's site was passed as a area for retail and business development with a to build on a small housing estate. This has not been fully developed and I understand it may because there are issues with asbestos and or some other contamination. Yet it seems it is fit for a pub selling food, a children's party play area and a supermarket selling some other consumable goods. If it is the case that there have been some bad decisions made around this site, the council officers responsible for passing this plan should own up and ensure this site is cleaned up. Enabling the plans many locals objected to, be completed. Of course this will mean a cost to the taxpayers whom are left carrying the financial burden of bad decisions made. I have no objection Education Land boarding Mount Road being to extend or build a primary school as have a shortage of places, the concern would be of increased traffic and the requirement for good provision of off road parking at the school if there were to be an entrance on that road. There is a site on the Buxton road Blackshaw Moor which has stood unused for many years since the Army ceased training there. It must have drainage, electrics and water on this site. This would be ideal for a small scale affordable housing site. It would also benefit the local school which has a small numbers of pupils and probably in danger of being closed in years to come Transport should not be a issue because there some buses to Buxton and local bus companies can benefit by providing peak time services. There must be other sites within Leek area suitable for developing. I tried to locate brownfield site on SMDC website but it shows many wordy documents but nothing is clearly stating where these sites lie. This could be my ineptitude but there could be more clarity for the lay person on these issues Building in such a large scale on The Mount would devalue housing already there. This may be viewed as a narrow minded but many people have worked hard and taken out huge loans to secure there desired homes. To effect there in such a drastic way I think is unfair and unnecessary. Most of the housing is currently at the higher end of the market and build social or low cost housing amongst this could be problematic from all prospective. If housing is built at the current level at these sites then who shall benefit those on low paid jobs, where I understand the most need is there are many units built as affordable part share homes unsold and many more privately owed sites of apartments etc. standing empty in Leek.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO3658 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 about Anzio Camp • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3942	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP			Support	[See Location Plan attached to Question 1]. [Letter attached to representation, stating:] Land at Mount Road, Leek Firstly, it should be noted that Renew Land Developments Limited are aware of third party opposition to potential housing development of land at Mount Road, Leek. Many objections to the proposed allocations object to the principle of development, in addition to other site specific matters such as visual impact, highways, drainage, biodiversity, etc. This representation comments on these various matters in turn. Principle of Allocating Land to the East of Leek for Housing Development The bulk of housing allocations suggested for Leek are proposed to the east of the town. The principle of allocating sites in this general area is supported for a number of reasons as set out below. Firstly, with regard to the principle of such an allocation, the LPA, in accordance with national policy, has to allocate a sufficient number of suitable, available and deliverable housing sites in order to ensure that objectively assessed housing needs can be addressed over the plan period. Failure to do so would render the Local Plan unsound at examination. Secondly, Leek is one of the largest towns across the District, so should be taking a significant proportion of the overall housing requirement because it already has significant infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the needs of additional development. Thirdly, if development needs are to be met, then sites outside of the existing settlement boundaries will be required to meet additional housing needs. The LPA has already confirmed that it will be conducting a Green Belt Review as part of the current Local Plan process. If the LPA is having to review its Green Belt boundaries around rural settlements and other towns, then Leek cannot be excluded from that process. Fourthly, much opposition to the proposed allocation of land currently designated as open countryside to the east of Leek is founded on the assumption that other previously developed sites are available. The site options consultation does identify a number of infill sites within the boundary of Leek, and many of these are former mill buildings or other vacant industrial or employment sites. However, these sites would not be sufficient on their own to meet the overall development requirements for Leek. Fifthly, land to the west of Leek is currently designated as Green Belt, and land to the north and west of the town is constrained as a result of them being located in areas at risk of flooding. Land to the south of the town is also covered by public open spaces / playing fields, as well as a large golf course, which limits development opportunities in these areas further. The above	Comments in support of this site, and clarification of landowner position, noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						views are supported by the LPA, who state that: The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). The west side of Leek is Green Belt and the study recommends that housing development should not take place on this side of the town to avoid adverse impacts. This means that sites at the eastern side of the town (which is not within the Green Belt) require consideration to meet Leek's future development needs. The Council is required to meet its housing needs to 2031 and there are not enough brown field sites in Leek to achieve this so the Council needs to consider both brownfield and green field sites. In light of the above considerations, it is considered that land to the east of Leek, including land at Mount Road, is considered to be a suitable location for housing development. Visual Impact The Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment identifies land to the west of Mount Road to sit below the ridge line that is situated further to the east of the town and outside of any area identified as having an "important landscape setting to the settlement". The sites at Mount Road otherwise adjoin the urban area and would be viewed in the context of the built form of the town, rather than as an isolated residential development. Highways The four parcels of land proposed as Draft Potential Allocations and Draft Reserve Sites are located to the west of Mount Road, and each site could be accessed directly off Mount Road. Site LE128A could also be potentially accessed off Kniveden Lane to the north (subject to further detailed investigations, and a secondary access to site LE127 could potentially be provided off Thornfield Avenue / High View Road. Any development of this site could facilitate the wider improvement of the local highway network as a result of developer contributions. Mount Road is part of a longer distance walking route and the site is located within 500 metres of local bus stops and is within a reasonable distance to primary and secondary education, such as Leek First School and Leek High School. Otherwise, the site is considered to be located in an accessible location. The supporting documentation provided with the current consultation states that " County Highways do not raise any issues which would prevent development of this site ". It is therefore concluded that access is achievable, and subject to further detailed design work, would not be a constraint to delivering housing on this site. Drainage The site is located within flood zone 1, and has a low risk of fluvial flooding compared with land to the north and west of Leek, which has a much higher risk of flooding. There have also been few recorded incidents of sewer flooding in the surrounding area as confirmed by the Council's own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. In light of the above conclusions, drainage or flood risk is unlikely to be a constraint to the development of this site. Biodiversity As part of the evidence base, the Council has commissioned a phase 1	

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						ecological study of the district. Within this study, the sites have been studied and have been grouped into three parcels. The three land parcels in the study are identified as 35, 39, and 40. All three sites were identified as having very low biodiversity value overall, comprising of species poor improved grassland, scattered scrub and poor hedgerow. The study recommends vegetation clearance at the appropriate time of year, and in the case of site 35, a bat survey of an existing outbuilding to the east. In light of the supporting evidence, it is concluded that biodiversity or the presence of protected species would not be a constraint to the development of land to the east of Mount Road. Conclusion Knights are making representations on behalf of Renew Land Developments Limited who are promoting their interest in land to the east of Mount Road for housing development. The site is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable. It is concluded that all of the land to the east [west] of Mount Road, as shown on the attached plan by Renew Land Developments Limited, should be developed. The site is located in open countryside, but not Green Belt, and the site is required to meet the open market and affordable housing needs of Leek given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and infill sites within the existing settlement are severely limited, and other areas of the town are constrained because of Green Belt, Flood Risk or because of landscape sensitivity. The council's own evidence base supports the potential allocation of land to the east of Mount Road. Leek is a large town at the top of the settlement hierarchy for the District, and cannot be excluded from helping to meet the housing requirement for the area. The release of land for housing on the eastern side of Leek is justified by the evidence base, and there are limited alternative options elsewhere around the town. The proposed release of land to the west of Mount Road through the Local Plan is therefore supported. The allocation the site would therefore ensure that the Council has a Local Plan that is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Trust that this letter is clear in expressing our supportive views of the Local Plan and the proposed allocation of land at Mount Road, Leek for housing development. Otherwise, Renew Land Developments support the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement to 320 dwellings per annum.	

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3934	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG			Object	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1] which states: The proposed urban extension to the east of the town...- LE127(100), LE128a(47), LE140(63), LE142a(140) and LE142b(40). The proposed extension also accommodates draft reserve sites LE069(42), LE128b(48) and LE066(50). These sites contribute a significant proportion of the proposed housing for Leek. The allocation of these sites, ahead of available brownfield/previously developed sites, is not in compliance Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy, which sets out the overarching strategy for development in Leek. ...None of the proposed allocations are considered likely to come forward in the short term based on the findings set out in the SHLAA (2015). However, we suggest that the allocation of sites which are deliverable within the short term should have been considered to a greater extent in formulating the preferred options due to the significant shortfall of housing delivery across the district. WYG consider that sites in Leek, such as LE243, are suitable to contribute to the short term delivery of housing in Staffordshire Moorlands. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the draft potential allocations weighs heavily on this eastern stretch of agricultural land and it is noted that no potential allocations have been selected within the core urban area.	• See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • The Council will be publishing emerging Local Plan policies for consultation in 2017 Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. • See para response to PO1681 about viability study As set out in the Options site assessment tables on the website, a number of sites within the Leek development boundary are not proposed as either preferred allocations or 'reserve' sites owing to the fact that these sites could come forward at any time and be assessed against relevant Local Plan and NPPF policies. • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4695	Mr And Mrs C and P Deighton				Object	We are writing to register our very deep concern about the proposal to build on the land at the Mount in Leek. Those involved in the making such decisions do not all live in Leek and probably unaware of the enormous importance of The Mount to the people living around it in Leek. The implications of losing this much loved countryside walk are very serious, and far reaching. The close proximity of The Mount to the homes of so many local people means that it is a place used regularly, often daily, for exercise and relaxation, and is vital to their health and mental well-being. A large number of local residents are elderly, and often unable to drive: there are young families who cannot afford a car: there are several care homes that residents come for walks with their careers. What make The Mount so important is that is so very close to people. It offers beautiful views across the fields and means that people, who cannot get out into the countryside further away, can still enjoy seeing the birds and animals here only just a small walk from where they live. People walking their dogs have a natural means of contact and conversation with others – so important especially for those who live alone. To sum up, we all be deeply distressed to lose this place. So many have been walking there all through their lives, the disruption, and seeing the gradual destruction of a cherished part of their lives will bring an increased sense of isolation, and the feeling of depression faced by those in their later years as they become less able to things without outside help. Having the ability to step outside and walk in open surroundings without having to ask for a lift means a lot to someone struggling to retain their independence and enjoyment for life. To build on The Mount is clearly not necessary. There are as we have all been made aware recently, many alterations for example: various Brown Field sites empty buildings such as factories and offices: disused mills, empty houses apparently unoccupied for long periods. In view of the very unpopular bad decisions made, and the continuing loss of trust in the judgement made and continuing loss of and motives, of the planning department many now suspect that the decisions are influenced mainly by financial incentives from Government or other sources. We do not know whether this is true, but it seems obvious to us that a prompt decision to abandon the idea of building The Mount would bring peace of mind to many Leek Residents and go a long way to restoring the publics belief that members of the Planning Department actually do care about, and will respond to, consider and respect the views, the well-being and even the happiness, of the town they responsible for looking after, both now and the future.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4826	Mrs L Scragg				Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways
PO4704	Mr and Mrs A & N Waterhouse				Object	Building 400+ houses on the area known by everyone as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gate way to the countryside would be against everything that "localism" would bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and it's unrivalled and area as a whole acts as a buffer, between the town and the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra houses would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and junctions at either end of The Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work, use the Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield Road with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek Town Centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for houses thereby saving this precious area for future generations to enjoy	The Council considers all petitions it receives in relation to formal planning consultations. They are also publicised on the Council's website including the action the Council proposes to take in relation to it. • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement The Localism Act provides for local communities to draw up their own 'Neighbourhood Plans'; however their content must meet certain Basic Conditions such as being in conformity with national and adopted Council Strategic Policies; and they are subject to Examination and Referendum. Note that the Council has not to date received applications from Leek residents to draw such Plans. • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5884	Ms Linda M Beighton				Object	I am writing to object to the proposed plan to allocate the following sites along Mount Road for housing: LE127, LE128a, and LE142a. Mount Road is used by hundreds of people every day of the week as a safe, sustainable leisure route something the council should be encouraging not removing. The current road for much of its length is too narrow for 2 cars to pass. Development would cause urbanisation & widening with the potential destruction of mature trees and dry stone walls. Exits particularly onto Ashbourne Road are already problematic and would need expensive, major work to cope with the extra traffic. People occupying houses at the moment would in the main work on the western side of the town in Cheshire-Manchester and Stoke. Major supermarkets are in the western side of town. Daily trips would further exacerbate the congestion which already chokes Leek. So many houses would destroy what is designated a special landscape area. They would impact on the views from the Peak Park and destroy an amenity area. Extending the own boundary to accommodate the proposed sites is undesirable. Using green field's sites may be expected and enable larger profits for developers but there are still brown field sites and infill land available within the moorlands district.	- See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 on highways The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. - See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9099	Ms S Naisbett				Object	I am writing to strongly object to the councils draft plan to build on the following area along Mount Road in Leek, Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 There are many other brown field sites in Leek such as Foker Grange and Home Farm that are available for development, and where houses could be built. Surely these sites should be used first for any planned housing development. The area along Mount Road should remain as it is. Beautiful open green fields. There should be no need to build further homes in the green belt of Leek when there are approximately 1,170 homes that are currently empty in the Staffordshire Moorlands, and an additional 2500 homes for sale. Leek is a Market Town, and this is its great appeal to the people who live here, and also to those who travel to the town to shop, as well as tourists who come to visit. If the town keeps growing due to more and more houses being built, it will no longer be an attractive historic market town, it will become a very large town centered around housing, and if the building continues year on year it will eventually result in Leek becoming a modern day city. Mount Road is a wonderful area of natural beauty that is also very educational for young children. My daughter and I often walk along Mount Road because she likes to be surrounded by the green open fields and the nature it holds. She loves seeing and learning about the different types of wild flowers, butterflies, wildlife and farm animals we see in the fields along Mount Road. If houses were built on Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 there would be nowhere locally for children who live in the area to experience this kind of nature and wildlife. Mount Road is also an extremely popular place for walkers, joggers, and cyclists, because it is currently a very quiet area, (has low noise pollution), and also has	- See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt - See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO89 on highways - See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development - See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence - See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing The Council maintains a database of housing site suggestions (SHLAA). This database formed the basis of the 2015 'Site Options' consultation as all SHLAA sites above a minimum size threshold, and attracting a 'B' deliverability rating, were included in that consultation. Subsequently 2016 'Preferred Options' were narrowed down from this (plus additional sites emerging through the call for sites process, deemed

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						few vehicles currently passing through it, hence is an area with low levels of air pollution. The green open spaces make it a very relaxing area, with wonderful views. If 380 houses were to be built in the area, it is estimated that over 750 more cars will be travelling along Mount Road on a daily basis, causing high levels of noise pollution and high levels of air pollution to the area. Thus making it a noisy, unhealthy, stressful area to walk, jog etc. This could lead to less people in the area going for walks etc/carrying out physical exercise. This goes against government efforts encourage people to be active and get fitter in order to fight against illness and obesity, e.g fit for life, and yet the Council is planning to build on a green field area which is ridiculous. Wildlife will be lost if houses are built on Mount road. My friends and I have seen wide variety of wild animals in the fields along Mount Road including wild rabbits, hedgehogs, badgers and buzzards. These areas of wildlife would be lost if houses were built here. The roads in the town are extremely busy with traffic. This makes them unsafe for young children to ride their bikes and scooters along. Mount Road is located on the very edge of town, and due to the current low traffic levels of traffic, this makes it an ideal area for children to safely ride their scooters and bikes. If 380 houses were built along Mount Road the road would become extremely busy with traffic making it another road which is not safe for young children to ride their bicycles. Question why don't disused buildings in Leek such as old mills be converted to affordable housing for young people, instead of allowing of 3, 4 or five bedroom luxury homes to be built along Mount Road- which is what developers will build along areas LE127a; LE128a; LE140. An example of this are the houses built relatively recently by Amos Group on land adjacent to Mount Road which were priced at over £230,000 each. All of the above reasons clearly show why the area along Mount Road Reference number should not be built on.	suitable). Home Farm site LE138 attracted a 'C' deliverability rating.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9141	Mr Ramon West				Object	We wish to object to the 4 preferred housing allocation sites on the Mount, Leek. It would be an outrage to proceed with residential development on any of these sites: LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a. The Council must take into consideration: Loss of local amenity - the Mount is a popular amenity enjoyed and cherished by walkers, joggers, cyclists, nature-lovers and dog-walkers. There is no comparable open countryside leisure amenity so close to the town centre. There is no comparable alternative within easy walking distance on the east side of town. Loss of such amenity would have an adverse effect on the health and wellbeing of a great many local people. Visual impact - the Mount is a classic example of outstanding moorland scenery. It provides unique and wonderful views over the town and beyond. Leek prides itself, and markets itself, as the Queen of the Moorlands. If this is to mean anything, the Council must do everything it can to halt the expansion of the town into the surrounding countryside and work to preserve the proximity and integrity of some of our finest moorlands scenery. Impact on infrastructure - hundreds of new houses will bring thousands of people. Nearby schools and GP surgeries will be put under further strain. Council services, social services and emergency services are already all under great strain. Traffic problems will be made worse. The future - the population of Leek is predicted to rise by a few thousand over the next couple of decades or so. This is mainly due to an ageing population. We are living longer. That means more of the people who are living here now will still be around in 20 or 30 years time. Therefore, planning for the future should be focused on local services for local people. We hope that the Council will heed our objections and explore alternative approaches to housing needs and development in our town. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to the 'Bimby Housing Toolkit' which was drawn up by the Prince's Foundation for Building Community (bimby.org.uk).	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note these assess the needs of 'older people' and other groups. The June 2014 SHMA concluded the number and proportion of older person households is expected to increase in the District over the period to 2031 (46% increase between 2011 and 2031) which has implications such as increased demand for both specialist/extra-care accommodation for older people, and for adaptable homes. Owing to an ageing population and other factors, the need for smaller units will in future exceed the need for larger, family units. For these reasons the SHMA recommends that 60% of future housing should be 1- or 2-bed. The Council's emerging Local Plan Policies expect larger housing schemes to provide for a mix of housing across all locations, to respond to identified local needs such as housing for older people. Note that where there is a policy requirement for affordable housing provision upon such sites, the nature of provision may reflect the above. The BIMBY toolkit is noted. The Council will continue to work with communities seeking to introduce (or influence the preparation of) Neighbourhood Plans, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9102	Mr Robert McGuinness				Object	Email with representation form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sites LE127/LE128A/LE140/LE142A and 'School Site' [presumed LE140] alongside 2015 'Options' sites LE066/LE069/LE128B with the following text: Overdevelopment, traffic congestion issues, inadequate infrastructure, inadequate road network. Brownfield sites and redundant mills should be brought into use first.	It is not considered that development of these particular sites would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design and landscape protection policies contained within the new Local Plan, and having regard to the Council's landscape evidence such as the 2016 Landscape Impact study. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that the local Plan does not allocate site LE069. • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9087	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9062	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick				Object	I am writing to put forward my opposition to the building of houses on Mount Road in Leek. It upsets me greatly to think that an important local amenity could be lost forever if these proposals go ahead. "The Mount" as we fondly know it, is a valuable asset to the East side of Leek, a wonderful place to take our families for walks and bike rides. In our busy lives, it is vital for our health, both mental and physical to have somewhere to go to relax and unwind. What better place than a walk along the Mount with views over Bradnop and Morridge, so accessible from our homes. If the fields in the planning proposals-LE127, LE128, LE140 and most worryingly on the opposite side LE142 were to be built on then the landscape of our beautiful town will be lost forever. For those arriving in to Leek from Ashbourne Road, they would be met with yet another sprawling housing estate, replacing the picturesque fields full of animals that are so welcoming to see. The road will become a main thoroughfare from the Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road and will lose its charm for us all. Lets protect the gateway to LEEK for generations to come. SAVE THE MOUNT.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9057	Mr Terence Gee				Object	I wish to object to the proposal to build housing on sites LE127,LE128,LE140,LE142a on mount road. This is a green field site with a rural road with unspoilt views only five minutes walk from Pick wood avenue. This road is used regularly by myself and often meet other walkers, cyclists in the area. Also the road would have extra traffic for 500 houses with poor access. There would be increased pressure on local schools,doctors,etc and I feel it would spoil the area with increased urbanisation.	• See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements
PO9070	Mr Stewart Johnson				Object	I am writing to protest against the proposed plans to build 4000 houses in the Leek area:- 1, question how many unoccupied properties are there in the area 2, Loss of beautiful countryside. 3, Work vacancies in the local area. 4, Local infrastructure . 5, Places at local schools. The list is just a few of the considerations the planners seem to be ignoring. Of particular concern is the proposed development along Mount Road. Not only would this destroy a beautiful part of the town used by many residents,it would also cause serious traffic problems both in the immediate vicinity and the rest of the town. These new residents would have to commute,and the main routes would be right through the centre of town adding to an already serious congestion problem. Why do the planners want to destroy the treasure that is The Queen of the Moorlands!	• See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways
PO9077	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9093	Ms Sarah Bishop				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands" , Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"! As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land, before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken in to deep consideration before this gem in the town is lost forever.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9313	Ms Emily Hodgkinson						
PO9404	Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9115	Mr Robert Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. It is also important to note that TOURISM is a significant driver to the local Economy! Therefore the Town Gateway, especially from the PEAK PARK Buxton Road A53, needs rigorous protection from urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of The Moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive and picturesque and is a key Tourist route. It is also a highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who very regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thornccliffe Road and its' adjoining lanes, and The Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horseriding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicing, and general enjoyment for health and wellbeing. The proposal area, particularly as it approaches the A53 Buxton Road junction with Thornccliffe Road and The Mount, is immediately adjacent to the SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its Historic Landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority in its protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is 'Special' in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There are a number of 'brown' sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. [Question why] these are not shown on the accompanying Consultation Maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be "The Preferred Option Housing Sites" in the view of the residents of Leek. There are also pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the Town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thornccliffe Road and The Mount Road is a Major Intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc.. It would put a major strain onto the area and have significantly adverse effects on the locality. The proposal is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the "housing requirement"[queries this as unjustified] along 1 narrow lane at the most Flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the "brown sites" and protect Leek's Heritage and inheritance!	- See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. - See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO4704 about special landscape area - See para response to PO89 on highways - See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus - See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9122	Mr Richard Pigott				Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Mount sites: Mount Rd is local amenity LE128 is the most elevated of the sites being considered LE066 is a brownfield site and should be considered ahead of LE128 Concentrating housing allocations on east side of town would raise deliverability problems compared to other areas of town Some western Leek sites in the Green Belt are nevertheless preferable to allocate for housing, than sites at the Mount.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence Note the 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that LE128A and LE128B are both of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. Whereas LE066 is assessed of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1681 about viability study
PO9130	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed. Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek int his issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total the lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a the lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	
PO9394	Mr Chris Taylor				Object	Land ref LE127: Development will block the broad view towards Leek, and will impact on the character and amenity of Mount road as a leisure walk. In any event it would seem to make sense, for a number of reasons, not least infrastructure considerations, to focus development at this stage towards the Buxton Road end of Mount road.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 on highways
PO9193	Mrs M Motum				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 on highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9243 PO9198	Mr John Belfield Mrs Maureen Belfield				Object	The rural fringe of Leek, and specifically Mount Road, would become urbanised. The Mount is a very popular route for leisure activities and exercise for many people and this would be lost. With the enormous number of proposed new houses there would be a massive increase in the amount of traffic both on the mount and also in the surrounding area. Kniveden Lane is already a busy road as it gives access to the small car park at the Moorlands Hospital. This car park is already insufficient for the needs of the hospital and many cars currently park on Kniveden Lane. If hundreds of houses are built on the mount Kniveden Lane would become a significant means of access to Ashbourne Road. The road network would need to be considerably enhanced and part of Kniveden Lane would need to be properly surfaced. This would lead to a major change in traffic patterns in the area which would lead to a loss of public amenity. This would not only cause traffic chaos but would also pollute the surrounding area. It would also make the smaller residential streets of Pitcher Lane and Trafford Close a potential car park for those who currently use Kniveden Lane for this purpose. There are brownfield sites available for building and also more suitable greenfield sites, for example Foker Grange and Home Farm, which have much easier access to the main road network. I therefore object to the building plans on the Mount which are numbered LE142a LE140, LE128a and LE127	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO9099 about Home Farm
PO9336	Mr Derek Kay				Object	Herewith are my objections yet again about building proposals affecting open greenbelt land on Mount Road. I strongly object to delininations LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, on the grounds of unnecessary and deleterious incursion into valuable scenic amenities. The fringes of this town (Queen of the Moorlands) must be preserved at all costs. Open aspects across towards the Peak District are essential for our spiritual wellbeing; unwelcome development of additional traffic flow and population density would be the corollary of this building project, were it to succeed. Conversely, there is much brownfield potential within the town boundary itself; rundown old mills for example (which may be protected by outdated listing orders) and other unsightly structures causing blots on the "townscape". Not enough positive action to clean up the interior of this town has been taken over the years. Use compulsory purchase orders where difficult site owners will not cooperate and make the Queen worthy of her name.	• See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Whilst Councils do retain CPO powers in principle, these are generally used (if at all) as a last resort

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							where it is expedient and in the public interest for the Council to do so, where agreement with landowners is not possible. As explained in para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance the Council makes assumptions that development schemes will come forward within the Leek development boundary to contribute to its housing need to 2031, which could include historic premises etc. Applications affecting listed or non-listed "heritage assets" would be assessed against Section 12 NPPF and Council Policies. The Council would also assess schemes in the town centre against the aspirations of the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan.
PO9236	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO699 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development • See para response in PO699 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement The Council must demonstrate to planning inspector that its Local Plan is based on the principles of sustainable development. The NPPF is clear that this means three roles – economic, social, and environmental, and that they are considered simultaneously. The Council's submitted Policies and objectives would therefore have to satisfy this.

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Im concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	
PO9179	Mrs E Adams				Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence
PO9212	Mrs E Adams				Object	I wish to place my strong objections to the proposals to build house on the mount, leek. It would devastate this beautiful area which benefits tourists and residents alike. Objections also relate to roads, schools, doctors etc. Please please rethink your plans.	• See para response to PO699 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9250	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1353 about streetlighting • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9292	Mrs Gwen Gledhill				Object	Re sites LE127,128,140.142a I wish to object strongly to the proposal to make these sites on The Mount available for housing on the following grounds: 1. Traffic The Mount is a narrow country lane with no pavements and little or no street lighting. There are narrow and dangerous junctions at both ends on to the Buxton and Ashbourne roads and a dangerous bend by LE127. The traffic generated by the proposed 400 houses will completely overload these junctions at busy times and generate a major risk to pedestrians on the lane itself, especially as there is not sufficient width for two cars to pass each other for most of the length of the lane. Commuters travelling from these house to Manchester, Macclesfield or Stoke will only add to the town centre traffic congestion at busy times. 2. The Local Housing Need It is well documented that the local need is for starter homes for young people and 'downsizing' homes for older people. These are not required on the edge of town but need to be closer to the centre where there are shops, amenities and better public transport links. Whatever developers initially propose re 'affordable housing' on The Mount, the reality is that they will ultimately build executive homes attractive to commuters travelling to Manchester, Stoke and beyond at prices cheaper than can be found in Cheshire East! I believe that the buyers will not be local people and thus the developments will not answer the local housing need. There are other sites that could address this need to the south and north west of the town and via infill in the centre itself. Planners should look more carefully at these and not settle quickly for 'easier' options. 3 Our Environment The Mount is a long standing area of natural beauty, accessible to most town residents on foot with views equal to those enjoyed across the Peak District. The developments will ruin this aspect and destroy a major, free, leisure experience for local people right on the edge of The Peak District National Park - their officers will (I'm sure) be objecting too!	• See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO9141 about housing for older people • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9163	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this. Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development • See para response to PO5884 about tree protection • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	
PO9228	MRS KAREN BARKER				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. There is much greater need for jobs/employment as priority in the town if people are to be enticed to come to live here by large scale housing developments. There are presently not enough jobs locally to adequately provide for the current housing occupants. There is likely to be an increased need for Housing Benefits affecting the local economy together with significant increased pressure on infrastructure due to need for travel in and out of the area for work. It is also important to note tourism is a significant driver to the local economy! Therefore the town gateway, especially from the Peak Park Buxton road A53, needs to be rigorous protection from the urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of the moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive picturesque and Tourist Route. It is also highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thorncliffe Road and its adjoining lanes, the Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horse-riding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicking and general enjoyment of for health and well-being. The proposed areas particularly as it approaches the a53 Buxton Road junction with Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road, is immediately adjacent to a landscape area which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its historic landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is special in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There is a number of brownfield sites within the town	• See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO9115 about design policies • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO4704 about special landscape area • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						which could be very effectively used for housing development. For some reason? These are not shown on the accompanying consultation maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites a is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be 'the preferred option housing sites' in view of the residents of leek. There are also pockets of green belt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitively to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road is a major intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc. The proposal will is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the housing requirement? Unjustified along 1 narrow lane at the most flagship side of leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the brownfield sites and protect leeks heritage and inheritance!	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9269	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as "Preferred Housing Allocation". There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to be adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners. 5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response in PO699 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9172	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	• See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence The NPPF expects Councils to meet objectively assessed development requirements, and also encourages brownfield development, subject to wider Policies. • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9203	Mr Martin Bagshaw				Object	I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development on the mount area of Leek. I have lived in Leek for all of my life and I and many others , have spent many happy hours enjoying the scenery and tranquility that this area of the town offers to residents of the town. To develop in this area will drastically reduce the local amenity for the residents of the town. It is a lovely picturesque area that is within easy reach of the town centre. And I believe that to destroy it would be an absolute travesty. The area has many amenity uses, such as walking, horse riding, cycling and jogging, let alone just sitting on the benches and chilling. I think the existing schools will struggle to cope with the increased demand for places. The increase the traffic on the roads surrounding the mount will be significant, and traffic calming measures will need to be considered for safety reasons and quality of life of the existing residents in the area. There also be an increase in commuter traffic from this development. I think the majority of which will have to cross the town towards either Stoke on Trent or Cheshire. This will add to the already considerable traffic issues in the town. I believe the Barnfields, the rear of Sainsbury and Foker Grange Farm would be much better locations, so that the increase in traffic is kept away from the town centre. It was my understanding the houses were proposed for the rear of Sainsbury's. But I understand this has hit commercial difficulties with residual contamination.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response PO2905 about other sites at the Mount
PO9218	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	• See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9278	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	• See para response to PO9115 about design policies • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement
PO9286	Mr Ian Harrison				Object	I hereby which to object to the building of houses etc on The Mount, Leek. This road, used by many is the last place to admire the scenic views of both Leek and the surrounding areas. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. If one site is given permission for house building, then all others will follow and question where will it end. There must be countless brown field sites in the leek area which can be built on first and foremost. If 500 houses were to be built, what happens to Leek. The jobs aren't there, infrastructure, the existing roads can't cope with todays traffic (constant gridlocks in the town centre, never mind 1000 further cars. No hope of a ring road around leek. Junior schools, can't cope with further numbers of school pupils. My wife and I continue to walk over the mount and admire the scenery, as well as the many more who walk, cycle, run and horse ride over it. The new housing would block the outstanding views people go the the mount to view.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements
PO9306	Councillor Gail Lockett				Object	I would like to objections to site allocations LE127 and LE128a, these two sites are completely unsuitable for development as the road would not be able to sustain the mount of traffic and the junctions at both end are dangerous, we should be looking at urban infill to distribute the number of houses required.	• See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9321	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots IE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example, the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance, for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country" walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built. There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important, local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO9115 about design policies The emerging Local Plan is not yet finalised and needs to undergo independent public examination by Government appointed Planning Inspector before it can become adopted. Planning applications arising before this happens must be determined against the NPPF and current Council planning policies. • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9347	Mr David Rowe				Object	I am writing to object to the selection of all sites on Mount Road, LE127, LE128, LE140 and LE142a. This road is of great value to local people as a very accessible place to experience and benefit from the surrounding countryside. Many people walk, cycle, exercise their dogs along this road every day, and this would be completely lost if development was allowed to take place. There are several brownfield sites in the town that should be considered instead, e.g. the old mills, Barnfields site.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9328	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is an quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9418	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	I am writing to make you aware of the concerns I have over the housing proposals for the Mount Road area, Leek, set out in Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Options and Development Boundaries Consultation. The consequence on traffic of building many houses in the Mount Road area will be very marked both in the immediate area and the town as a whole . Immediate area Mount Road is not wide enough to safely take a major increase in traffic. The road is very popular with walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Increased traffic will discourage such use and be a danger to those leisure users who do continue to use the road. The existing access points to the area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are woefully inadequate and dangerous for high volumes of vehicles. If, as is most likely ,Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road would be great. At present the limited amount of traffic means that the restricted visibility due to the trees on Ashbourne Road causes minimal problems. An increase in traffic queues would lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the consequent destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Question where will they go to do these two activities. Work Very few will work in Buxton or Ashbourne which are easily accessible from Mount Road. The vast majority will work in the town centre, the Barnfields industrial estate or on Cheadle Road. Those commuting out of town will be mostly heading for Stoke or Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the centre of town at least twice a day at peak times as there are no alternative routes they can use. Shopping To reach the two large supermarkets in Leek (Morrison's and Sainsbury's) residents of the Mount Road area would be forced, by the road system, to travel through the centre of town. Those shopping further afield will, in the main, be heading for Stoke and Macclesfield and again will need to travel through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that major building to the east of Leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the Mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging sites are LE142b and LE140. Question is there not a possibility of building on the existing sites of Kniveden Hall (which is well screened by trees) and the old Social Services site. These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and in town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway into an linear park (The High Line). Would that Leek had planners and leaders of similar vision to develop Mount Road into The High Lane for the benefit of all the community.	• See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO5884 about tree protection • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO89 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO9122 about landscape evidence Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging Local Plan contains a policy protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9299	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9423	Mr Michael Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!! There are loads of other areas in Leek that are within the boundaries of leek and not on green field sites (Huge's Concrete site for one) Leek dose not need this amount of housing there is not the work/jobs for the increase in people. This is all about money in the pocket for the council. If we need another primary school increase extend Beresford Memorial school there is about 3 acres of fields behind the school.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO9203 about existing industrial areas • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO673 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO673 about Leek educational requirements
PO9376	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west	• See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						side of Leek are developable.	The map in the Preferred Options consultation document is intended to illustrate proposed allocations and development boundaries and other summary information, not the extent of land ownerships. • See para response to PO673 about educational requirements • See para response to PO679 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO9122 about landscape evidence
PO9384	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1750 about affordable housing • See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1732 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response PO679 about identification of sites during 2015 and 2016 public consultations

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9395	Ms Katie Giddings				Object	I wish to register my strong objection to the sites identified for development along The Mount, Leek. The site reference numbers are LE127, LE128, LE140 & LE142a. The Mount is highly valued by the people of Leek. Hundreds of people use it every day & enjoy the landscape and views. These people cover a broad mix - there are walkers & strollers, hikers & joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists - and they range through all ages, from young to old. Generations have taken the air along The Mount and future generations deserve the same opportunity. Chance and regular encounters with this variety of people whose paths would probably otherwise not cross creates the sense of community so often lacking elsewhere but celebrated in Leek. The view of Leek from The Mount creates a sense of belonging to and connection with the whole town, enhancing this sense of belonging. I may not live the other side of Leek but I can see it every time I walk the Mount and feel part of its whole. The town is visible from The Mount & I can enjoy the view of its special architecture & character. This natural landscape is free for everyone to enjoy and is accessible within minutes of the town centre. It is a landscape and community which would be lost forever should the developments go ahead. Such things are irreplaceable and I despair that The Mount is even being considered as a suitable option. I am a recent newcomer to Leek having moved here three years ago. I have never lived anywhere more welcoming and cheerful and full of people appreciating and making the most of living in such a beautiful place. The Mount is at present a country lane offering peace and tranquil exercise. Its urbanisation would completely change its character and make it a main road connecting Ashbourne & Buxton Roads. The traffic increase would be beyond that contributed to by extra housing as it would become a highly attractive route for those seeking to avoid Leek town centre. The access to and from Ashbourne Road would also radically change the character of that end of town. The increased housing would alter the balance of the town and there is simply not that level of demand for housing in that area. The figures of required housing also appear to be based on doubtful statistics so that the very need for this level of housing in the Moorlands is questionable. It would really be dreadful if this so very important natural landscape were to disappear forever from Leek. In conversation with the people I meet along the Mount, there is a strong feeling of being threatened by changes beyond their control & of losing something very precious. Many people have said they have no faith that their feelings and needs will be valued. Please change their minds and show that local people will be listened to and their objections acted upon. Please don't build on The Mount.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO89 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO256 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1353 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9410	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	• See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO256 about air pollution and environmental health considerations of development
PO9428	Ms Catherine Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!!	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO89 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO256 on ecology evidence
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town.	• See para response to PO89 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO89 on highways • See para response to PO1353 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement

Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations LE127 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO679 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO35	MRS KATRINA KEMSHEAD		MR COLIN KEMSHEAD		Support	This allocated area has now been reduced. I could see no reason why the whole of plot LE128 has not been allocated as housing. The original scheme was for approximately 93 units. Reducing it down to 47 does not make it such a viable economic proposition, bearing in mind the requirement for affordable housing. I would have preferred for the whole site to be allocated.	Comments and confirmation of owner position, noted. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount are not required. The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
PO4399	Mr Andy Frost	Frost Planning			Object	On behalf of our client, The Kemshead Family, we wish to make Representations in respect of the above parcel of land. The aim is to secure the allocation of the entire site within their ownership for residential development in the emerging Local Plan. Preferred Housing Allocation LE128A should be extended further southwards to include all land within our client's ownership. We consider there is a compelling case to support this given the level of housing need identified, the proposed distribution of housing, and the characteristics of the site. The Plan is therefore 'unsound' at present. [Refer to full Supporting Statement attached to Question 1].	Refer to PO35 response above Table 4.1 in the preferred Options consultation document explains how the set of Preferred Options housing sites for Leek would satisfy the town's OAN (as per Policy SS3 Core Strategy).
PO90	Mr Bill Reid				Object	This area is a most popular area for walkers, runners, drivers and strollers. It has been, for as long as I can remember, an area that provides views over Leek town and the surrounding area which cannot be equalled. It is a beautiful peaceful part of Leek which should not be spoilt by housing estates and the disruption that goes with it. The top of Kniveden Lane has a piece of unadopted road which deters motorists from using it as a thoroughfare and I am sure that this would become adopted if the proposed plans go ahead causing untold traffic, noise and pollution, as well as the dangers to residents from the traffic. There are many areas around Leek which would be far more suitable.	The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's adopted Core Strategy policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral "urban extensions" around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low-through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures. It concluded that both LE128Aa and LE128B are of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022/LE127/LE128/LE140/LE142A/LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development.
PO125	B & M Bentley				Object	Urban extension for New Housing is opposed on Mount Road. The relevant issues are 1. Landscape & historic character	See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						2. Health & quality of life 'The Mount' is a known cultural and unique feature for Leek folk and visitors gained over many generations. Offering: Visual beauty, health and community amenity. The many attractions of a 'trip around the mount' would be largely lost. These comments refer to LE127, LE128a and LE140.	All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access
PO192	Mr John Pigott				Object	The following comments apply to three areas allocated for housing development on Mount Road: LE127, LE128a and LE142a The proposal to build in these three blocks along both sides of Mount Road should be removed as the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre and is a very popular route for walking, jogging and cycling. It is also on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk giving panoramic views over the centre of Leek and the hills beyond. The Mount is a very important local amenity which has been completely underestimated and its value not understood.. A local resident carried out a head count on Sun 8th May between 0700 and 2000 and counted a total of 217 people using the road for recreation : 190 walkers (44 with dogs, 8 with prams), 12 cyclists, 12 joggers and 3 horse riders. These were not in organised groups but simply people enjoying the exercise, the views and the fresh air in a safe and sustainable way – no need to get the car out. If the developments proceed then inevitably Mount Road, which is now a country Lane, would be widened and become a busy estate road and people would not want to use it for recreation. Instead of building along Mount Road, the brownfield sites and other sites within the town boundary should be developed first. These include the following sites which were shown on the original plans but now taken out : LE 219, LE073, LE067, LE147, LE037 and LE063	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO90 about highways Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral "urban

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							extensions" around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. Note that site LE073 has since been granted residential planning consent under SMD/2015/0523.
PO117	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	New houses will create more traffic on Mount Road which is very narrow in places. Housing will spoil the views of residents already in the area. The Mount should be left for public to enjoy open spaces.	• See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access
PO227	Miss Alicia Guy				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also. It could bring house prices down as at the moment it is such a lovely peaceful area and this no doubt will change	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
PO232	Mr Daniel Frith						
PO220	Mr Andrew Bodiam				Object	Like many others I have enjoyed walking on the Mount for 12 years and the planned housing site allocations in this area will completely destroy one of Leek's most valuable assets. Just take a walk along Mount Road and imagine what it would be like with the planned housing in place. I appreciate the Governments requirements but I am far from convinced that Leek's rural countryside should be sacrificed to their cause when there are so many brown field sites available. Furthermore, Leek is not a commuter town and I wonder if there is really the demand for 600 houses especially when those that are for sale take forever to do so. I would therefore ask you to think again.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken into account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO678	Andy McGraw				Object	Extension of the Town Boundary into the Natural Zone The following blocks identified as, potentially suitable housing sites, all appear to be outside the town boundary on the maps supplied by	Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, on this second housing consultation June 2016 Block numbers; LE 127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a, LE142b All the above mentioned blocks are therefore proposed to be constructed on the Natural Zone land surrounding the town of Leek. Public Amenity The small narrow lane known as Mount Road which travels between the A53 Leek/ Buxton road and A523 Leek/ Ashbourne road along which the following blocks appear, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a, are used on a daily basis as a public amenity. The lane is constantly used by locals and visitors to walk, ride and enjoy the views in relative safety at present. If the proposed housing goes ahead, with the number of houses planned on these sites, this road will undoubtedly suffer a dramatic increase in the number of vehicles using it, by averaging 2 cars per household, thus reducing its safety and relative quiet enjoyment. The views over the town of Leek and its surrounding countryside will also be affected detrimentally. I also note that the lane is included as part of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks, advertised and mapped by the Ordnance Survey as a recreational path but not highlighted as such on the SMDC consultation map. Surely the increase in vehicular traffic would compromise this route. Other public rights of way, public footpaths, are either not shown or seem now to stop at the new development. When I raised the question of this fact at consultation the officer was unable to answer my query. In these times of austerity and the constant cut backs to local government, areas of free enjoyment and recreational use which also merit health benefits need to be conserved. Wildlife Concerns The blocks shown as, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a are frequently used by several bird species, especially during the winter months, as important feeding grounds. Some of these bird species are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CA81) as Schedule 1 protected species, identified by BirdLife International as Globally Threatened species and are listed as Red List species of birds of conservation concern by organisations, the RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), the British Ornithologists Union, Natural England and the British Trust of Ornithology, to name a few. The birds in question are; Fieldfare Turdus pilaris, Schedule 1 W&CA 81 and Red List species Redwing Turdus iliacus, Schedule 1 W&CA81 and Red List Species Starling Sturnus vulgaris, Red List species The small block of land between blocks LE127 and LE128a is also important to wildlife in particular bird species. Although this land is not earmarked for development I feel that the disturbance of the development would compromise the species using it. This small wooded block is used during the winter months as an important winter roost for a small number of Raven Corus corax, a species again afforded a certain amount of protection. Species using this	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about public rights of way The consultation map is intended to depict summary information only; it does not for example illustrate public rights of way. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						block to breed include, Little Owl <i>Athene noctua</i> , although not afforded any specific protection via acts of Parliament or listed as a concern yet, it is a species showing major decline, UK population estimated to be down by 24%, as highlighted by the RSPB breeding bird data 1995 – 2008. Great Spotted Woodpecker <i>Dendrocopos major</i> , Nuthatch <i>Sitta europaea</i>, are other examples of regular breeding species in this area. Due to disturbance I predict that many of these species will refrain from using this important area. Infrastructure As mentioned previously the numbers of new houses proposed in the areas of Mount Road and Thornccliffe Road, blocks LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, will put an enormous strain on the local infrastructure and road system. We all constantly experience the difficulties whilst travelling through the town of Leek caused by any one road closure. Both junctions from Mount Road can be difficult to negotiate now with the small amount of traffic using it with the A523 being particularly dangerous in its present form. Problems with access at both these junctions will be severely increased with the increased volume of traffic. At the original consultation July 2015 there was no mention of increasing employment opportunities even when the question was raised. I still feel that these concerns have yet to be addressed. It was implied but not confirmed that most of the individuals who would be residing in the new development would be commuter based, travelling to nearby cities to seek their employment. This surely is contrary to most local government policies that are tasked with reducing this activity to contribute towards climate change and global warming issues. These planned developments will also have a visual, probably a negative impact from the adjoining Peak District National Park as it will be observed from the iconic Roaches and the boundary road of Morridge. There seems to be little or no mention of the use of brown field sites throughout the proposal. With the relaxation of planning rules for developing these sites should the Council look to these sites first. Removing deteriorating buildings and areas within the town that look unsightly and replacing with new developments would surely enhance the town, and, as they are close to amenities within the town centre, reduce the need for occupants to use their motor vehicles on shopping trips or evening entertainment. There are also a number of old mills and factories within the existing town boundary that could and should be transformed and upgraded into apartment blocks, as they have in	other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						other towns and cities in the UK, which would save those buildings from further degradation, provide perfect housing within the town and help to keep the overall feel of the town and its history. Conclusion In conclusion it is my belief that the proposed development and size of that development will have a serious and negative impact on the market town of Leek and its Natural Zone boundary. As a society in general we are losing touch with nature and the great outdoors. There are Government initiatives to reverse and combat this trend. Organisations, funded by the National Lottery, Government, County and Local councils including SMDC, are tasked to promote these initiatives assisting people to re-engage with nature. We are also constantly reminded these days of health, well-being and mental health issues that our society is increasingly subject too due to the pressures of our modern living and the need for places for people to unwind. With this in mind how can we justify increasing the urban zone into our countryside. We have a duty to protect iconic landscapes, open spaces and the biodiversity such as can be found within the Mount Road area for the future generations of this fantastic town, so that they too, can experience quiet and peaceful recreation as we have enjoyed over the years. Maybe the Officers involved in making the final decisions should take an early morning walk along the Mount Road to experience these quiet and peaceful surroundings with the only noise being provided by the local bird-life with their dawn chorus. Once we lose these areas they are lost forever.	In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend.
PO674	Mr Jonathan Hulme				Object	The mount is an important, free, extensively used recreation facility for Leek. The proximity of the mount to the town makes it easily accessible, providing a rural escape for walkers, cyclists, joggers and families alike. This invaluable resource contributes to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all who use it. The mount provides panoramic views of the town and surrounding moor land including the Roches, and housing developments should not encroach on this. The junctions with the A53 and the A523 are also quite dangerous and unsuited to large amounts of traffic. Some form of traffic management would need to be added to these junctions, increasing congestion in and around the town to even higher levels than currently (which is already too high!!). This deters visitors to the town, reducing the amount of tourist trade. The area is also important ecologically and accommodates a variety of species, some of which appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. This excessive allocation of sites appears to be national policy implemented at a local level without consideration of local needs and demographics. The infrastructure in the east of the town is insufficient to cope with a population influx. For instance, the schools and health facilities are already full. Housing development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in the town such as Davenport mill on Mill Street and the mill on Ashbourne Road. The developers who own	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						these sites should be incentivised to commence development. Redevelop eyesores, don't diminish beauty spots.	infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO700	Mr John Burnett				Object	This existing field forms an intrinsic part of the open space known as the Mount. As such it provides views over the town out to the Macclesfield and Ladderedge areas and for users of the Mount affords an area of outstanding natural beauty. Building on this plot of land would severely restrict the views available and would mean that use of the Mount Road as an exercise and recreation facility would be severely restricted. I would also object based on my concerns that building in this location would have severe impact on both existing infrastructure including roads and schools and would affect the ground water run off causing issues in other areas of the town. Building on this land would demonstrably damage the aspirations of the local community and would have severe economic and environmental consequences - completely at odds with the objectives of the consultation.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that subsequent development proposals would be required to integrate sustainable drainage features into layouts, as required by the Flood and Water Management Act.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1352	Mr A Birks				Object	This morning whilst taking my constitutional stroll around Mount Road I happened upon a group of people considering the best plots to build houses in this beauty spot. One member of the group introduced herself as a local councillor. My heart sank as it became clear that some minds at least, against the wishes of the local people, the decision to build seems to have been taken. It is outrageous that the local community is once again to be ignored by those elected to serve us. Mount Road is a very important part of the social scene of Leek as local people use it daily to enjoy the countryside which is within their homes. It would be an ecological and social outrage to remove this facility from the people of Leek. This area is more important to the wellbeing of residents from across the town than any other area around Leek as it is their gateway to a relaxed walk in the fresh air in the countryside. Any development of this area would change the nature of Leek as it would necessitate the widening of the road, the installation of lighting and the uprooting of that special commodity trees. The Mount Road would be a major thoroughfare between the Ashbourne Road, and Buxton Road, Kniveden Lane. Would be a conduit between the same roads meaning heavy traffic rushing through the estate and there would be problems caused by necessary construction of major road junctions at each end of the Mount Road. Local residents this would be a disaster. There is a concern too that, with the addition of a large number of houses in this area, the infrastructure at this end of town would be challenged beyond its ability to cope. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very full and recent queues of vehicles to get into town were horrendous during the roadworks in the town. Imagine the chaos should we add another 500 families in the queue. In the unlikely event that Leek should actually need extra accommodation, consideration should be given to brownfields or less intrusive sites first. There are several derelict mills which could be utilised for apartments or demolished for housing. The infrastructure of drains, electricity and gas is readily available near these 2 areas too. I appeal to the council to reflect on the wishes of those who elected them to serve their needs and reject the idea of developing this area and retain it for enjoyment and health of the many people of Leek who appreciate it.	The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. • See para response to PO674 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1323	Mr Stapleton	Leek And District Civic Society			Object	I write on behalf of Leek & District Civic Society to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision to include The Mount' Leek as a preferred option for housing development. This area is heavily used by recreational walkers and is the sort of local amenity which would be absolutely spoilt by additional building. Leek has few enough open spaces as it is and the loss of The Mount would be completely unjustifiable. Of all the site options in the Leek area, The Mount is the one which we feel should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected for the present populace and future generations.	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. - See para response to PO90 about 'Options Site Assessments'
PO1146	Mr R Harrison				Object	I have recently looked at the site plans and talked to one of your officers concerning the location: This is a narrow road, used by many recreational purposes such as walking, cycling The views over Leek Conservation area and its surrounding area are 2 nd to none both night and day There have been lots of houses built on the east side of Leek in recent years mainly off Ashbourne road. As the majority of people travel to Macclesfield, Manchester and Stoke on Trent to work, this means they have to travel through the centre and often Leek is gridlocked at busy times The exits from the Mount onto Buxton and the Ashbourne Roads are both very narrow and difficult to negotiate. Schools at the end of the town are already full to capacity and young children have to be taken across Leek early in the morning and collected in the evening. Drs Lists are so full. We are told that some of these houses are possible affordable housing. What does this mean? There are plenty of small terrace house on the market which I would consider as affordable. So do we need more? In fact do we need a 1000 new houses to in Leek at all anywhere? If so I would like to think that there are possible sites in Leek - West End could be given consideration before further action is taken. Leek is a beautiful small town with easy access to countryside. By allowing building on The Mount Road that access will be diminished as more of our green fields turned into housing developments and country roads become clogged with vehicles. Where will it end?	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about highways - See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO125 about 'Options Site Assessments' - See para response to PO674 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO674 about educational requirements The Council consults with its Housing Officer when setting definitions of 'affordable' in relation to affordable housing. This usually equates to a percentage of open market value which represents the upper limit that the house can be sold/resold. - See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO863	Mr Daniel Noble				Object	There are three main topics on which I object to and reserve sites along Mount Road including site LE128. Concerns that the local infrastructure cannot support the level of building proposed The spoiling of a popular amenity Concerns over flood risk Many of the proposed potentially developable sites are in the East of Leek, suggesting a large quantity of housing will be built in the east end to fulfill the proposed housing requirements. The east side of Leek is already stretched when it comes to critical amenities such as schools and County Education acknowledged this in the 2015 consultation. However I don't believe that any suggestions have been put forward by the District and County Council. I believe this to be a significant roadblock and should be addressed before continuing with the housing consultation. It should be clear that any significant building on this or any of the Mount sites will require improvements to the road including, but not limited to, widening and creation of pavements and better access from the Ashbourne Road end. Access for residents on this site will make the Mount much busier - especially considering my comments above that multiple proposed sites will need to be built on to support the plan. This will mean a popular "quiet lane" will become not only much busier but a "rat run" from the Buxton Road to the Ashbourne Road. This would be a hugely negative impact on an important local amenity i.e. The Mount. The Options Site Assessments report (Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf) acknowledges that building on this site will require improvements to the badly potholed eastern end of Kniveden Lane, thus creating a through access for motor vehicles that doesn't currently exist in a satisfactory form. The estate taking in Kniveden Lane and Moorland Road is currently very quiet and is not generally used as a through route. This makes it a relatively safe place for children to play outside and I have significant concerns that losing this sense of security would be another reason to discourage children from playing outside. Our children need encouragement to be active, not discouragement through reduced safety. The Mount - particularly south of Kniveden Lane -	• See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response in PO700 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						is an extremely popular semi-rural location which is used by many for walking, cycling, horse-riding and running. It is a sound surface with superb far-reaching views, offering uniquely easy access to enjoy a stunning countryside location. Any building on the proposed LE128 site will spoil the views that extend to the Roaches, Shutlingsloe, the Cloud and beyond. With well-recognised concern that many people are not maintaining a satisfactorily healthy lifestyle, any spoiling or removal of a locally and culturally important leisure amenity would be a huge blow to not just the east end of Leek but the whole town. Severn Trent Water have acknowledged that "they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development." However I've not seen any specifics in the Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf and this concerns me in relation to plot LE128a/b which continues to have significant drainage issues. Frequently rainwater can be seen draining off LE128b at the SW corner and onto Moorland Road. My concern is that if draft potential allocation LE128a is built on (regardless of whether reserve allocation LE128b is built on) this drainage problem will be exacerbated and I've seen no plan or evidence of how that will be remedied. As per my 2015 consultation response I should re-iterate that the land drains that lead off LE128 into the culvert under the gardens of the easterly Moorland Road properties already struggle to cope with the water run-off from LE128. I have grave concerns that the existing drains will not support the necessary drainage of the proposed housing development. This is especially pertinent since I'm resident at the SW corner of the proposed plot on the Moorland Road side and get the bulk of the water draining under and across our plot.	
PO935	Mr Chris Clark				Object	Building houses adjacent to Mount Road would premanently destroy the panoramic view of Leek from this location. Mount Road is used daily by walkers, providing easy access to those living towards the north and east of the town. Kniveden Lane is virtually a no-through-road, as it is currently very rough at the top (Mount Road) end. As such, Kniveden Lane is relatively safe for children and elderly residents. Buiding house here would open up Kniveden Lane to a large amount of through traffic, including others trying to avoid current conjection sites closer to the town centre. If houses were to be built in this location, most residents would work in Stoke-on-Trent (or Macclesfield), which would add to traffic conjection through the town at peak times.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1017	Mrs Julia McGraw				Object	Proposed Housing Leek East I wish to record my objection to the proposed housing allocations in the area known as the Mount Road, Leek. Block numbers LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a Justification As a resident of Moorland Road I own 3 dogs that I walk daily around the Mount and surrounding areas. I enjoy the tranquillity that these walks offer as at present there is minimal disturbance from vehicular traffic. I enjoy meeting others whilst walking as well as watching the areas wildlife that I spot on my walks and savour the ever changing landscape and views on offer. I have health issues and exercise is an important part of my daily regime. If the planned housing goes ahead then I feel that the tranquillity and aesthetic value of the area will be lost. I also feel that there will be a greater use of the road by vehicular traffic thus making it less safe to walk with my dogs. My health issues make life difficult but I know that my daily walks help me to cope by lifting my spirits. Loosing this fabulous public amenity to housing, when there are other more favourable and practical sites within the town boundary that could be used, could have a detrimental effect on my health and well-being, I'm sure many other users will feel the same. I really hope that you listen to your residents and constituents as I truly believe that our lives will be somewhat poorer with this planned urbanisation of our countryside which will reduce further our places to walk locally and safely. The Mount provides local people with somewhere to walk, dream and escape the demands of our busy lives locally without having to use our motor vehicles, accompanied by our families, friends and dogs and is of paramount importance to all its users. A walk around a housing development will not offer the same enjoyment and pleasantness.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1713	Mr G Carding				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on Mount Road leek. The Mount has been a historic to the people of leek for generations for its 360 degree panoramic views of natural beauty. Being born in Leek I have walked over the mount all my life and always enjoyed the peace and quiet surrounded by the countryside views which are irreplaceable building housing in this area would also destroy the wildlife and a result in the loss of open space. This road is unsuitable for the large volume of traffic which would be generated by all the new houses and is narrow in places with dangerous junctions at both end of the road. The roads in this part cannot take any more traffic. Please find more suitable site within the town, if we keep building out into the countryside where will the border of Leek End? Ashbourne	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1572	Mrs S Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount. It is a icon beauty spot, Leek's gateway into the open country side and has been popular with walkers, joggers, cyclist and horse riding for generations and should be protected for future generations to I strongly recommend further consideration be given to the developing the empty mills, brownfield Sites and making use of the many vacant homes in the Moorlands before surrendering our precious Greenfields to hungry developers	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence
PO1579	Mr PJ Chauveau						
PO1482	mrs Brenda pigott				Object	Mount Road is a important amenity for local people who walk, joy, cycle, walk dogs etc along this country road. The field (LE128a) is the most elevated of the fields being considered & across the best views over the greatest sense of tranquillity. LE066 is brownfield site which has lower public amenity value & should be considered ahead of LE128a. People walk both ways along the road best views are seen when walking from Ashbourne Road and towards the Roaches. You can see the 500m, high 'Matterhorn of Cheshire' called Shuttingstoe as you walks towards the Roaches. Also lovely views across fields with sheep or cows in often to Leek's Skyline with many Churches and landmarks. The road forms a part of a 9 miles circular walk called Staffordshire Moorlands. I regularly walk or cycle along Mount Road and have done for more than 40 years as my 3 sons and my husband. This road would need upgrading & with so much extra traffic the attraction/amenity that is now, would be lost.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence Note the 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that LE128A and LE128B are of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. Whereas LE066 is assessed of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO90 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1688	Mr David Morgan				Object	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to build houses on the Mount. I specifically object to the building off houses on sites: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. When I first heard about the proposal to build in this area. I was genuinely shocked and still cannot believe that the proposal have been submitted to build on such beautiful landscape which has helped to shape leeks identity as Queen Of the moorlands. I work in the local community and I have not heard a single resident of Leek express support for these proposals – they have expressed deep anger and concern. I live locally to the Mount and regularly take walks there and it is very clearly, a popular destination for walkers and cyclist. However, I do not feel that this is area that is solely of Leek by these who live in its vicinity. I believe that the mount is an area that the people of Leek genuinely cherish and it would be a tragedy if a major housing development were built along it, The Mount does provide an important amenity for local residents including Hargate estate. I feel it would be unacceptable to build houses on it, spoiling the unspoilt beauty of the area and leading to a huge increase in the traffic which would obviously cause a major hazard to walkers and cyclist. I feel it is unacceptable to deprive residents of a very built up area such as Haregate estate of the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful country side and open space this that the mount offers. If this proposal is passed then I feel that the character and identity of Leek will be very adversely affected and this will have a very detrimental impact on its image in terms of visitors and attracting business	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend. • See para response to PO674 on design • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO1280	Mrs B Ward				Object	I write once again to protest against the proposed development of housing along and off mount road. We have already had 2 public enquires and each time the inspector has upheld the decision not to allow these fields to develop along mount road. This is a great amenity for the town, especially for residents this side of leek. I feel that we have been left a short stretch off mount road but with all the roads going off it Mount Road itself will probably have to be widened and will become a bi pass for traffic between Buxton Road. Walking along a country lane enjoying the views. Do people walk as much on the other side of town? Aren't there still places for the development within the town? Not touching our open spaces. Where are 600 new houses on Mount Road going to work?	The Council must justify proposed land allocations which form part of its new Local Plan to planning inspector during public examination of the Local Plan. The Inspector must consider the 'soundness' of the Plan as per para 182 NPPF. Note that as part of this process the Council must demonstrate that it meets its objectively assessed development requirements for housing (and other land uses) for the District. • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1404	Mrs Smith	M			Object	With regard to the proposed 400 plus houses to be built on the mount, I would like to express my concerns on the matter. I can't help but for see the problems 400 to 800 cars will create, trying to leave Mount Road to gain access to the Buxton Road. They will be queuing up! Most families these days have at least one car some have two. Mount Road was not built for such traffic	See para response to PO90 about highways
PO1484	Mrs Lane	C			Object	I object to any housing being built in this area. It is an area used by many people for walking etc. – many for health reasons e.g. for me. We must keep our open spaces that are in walking distance of our town, once lost – gone forever. Don't let us loose it	See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1745	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	LE142b, le142a, le140, Le128a, Le022, Le127 I write to object to the proposal to all the building of housed along mount road as set out in the preferred options doc. My 2 main objections are based on the implications for the environment and the traffic. Environment – For generations Mount Road has been a favourite walking/cycling/horse riding route for many residents of Leek. It is easily accessible (not requiring a car to reach it) and is quiet safe place by way which can be used by all people of all ages in all weathers. The major attraction is walkers are the outstanding vista the road provides both town and county. The proposed building at the north would destroy the turn the road into a noisy, busy thoroughfare, that would be unsafe and unpleasant for walkers and all over leisure users. The proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean the views of the town would be lost. At a time when all our members of society are being encouraged to take more exercise the destruction of the mount is free, natural gym, seems very short sighted. Immediate area Mount road is not a wide enough area to safely take a major increase in traffic. The existing access points to this area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are wholly inadequate and dangerous for the high volume of vehicles. If as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road causes minimal amount of problems. An increase in traffic will queues will lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Where will they go to do these activities? Traffic The consequences of the traffic of building many houses both in the immediate area and the town as whole will be very marked. Work Very few work in Buxton or Ashbourne which re easily accessible from the mount. The vast majority work in the town centre, the barn field's industrial estate or on Cheadle road. Those commuting out of the town centre will be heading mostly to stoke Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO192 about public rights of way - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO674 on design - See para response to PO90 about highways The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. - See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO125 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that the major building works to the east of leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging site LE142b and LE140. Is there not a possibility of the building on the site existing site of Kniveden Hall (which is screened of by trees) and the old Social Services building? These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and still generate a lot more traffic throughout the town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway in a linear park (the high lane). Would that Leek had planners and leader of similar vision to develop mount road into a high lane for the benefit all off the community	The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142B is of high landscape sensitivity and development could be visible from the peak Park, and the rural approach to Leek; - LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended; - LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging Local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.
PO1700	Mr Michael Owen				Object	My wife and I would like to tender our personal objections to any proposed house building along Mount Road Leek. We don't feel that the area has infrastructure to cope with the number of houses proposed and would spoil the landscape of a very popular and picturesque area used extensively by Leek residents	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1675	MRS A Staton				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. The grounds for that are: Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town. Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting. Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1 st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of leek will become more common. Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking. High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area. Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments procede then the 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event. The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1352 about streetlighting • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO192 about public rights of way • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO35 about viability study
PO1651	Mrs G Webster						
PO1645							
PO1642	Mrs J Lownds						
PO1669	Mr W Johnson						
PO1666							
PO1657	Mr S Panek						
PO4768	Mr A Panek						
PO4757	Miss J Panek						
	Mrs A Lomas						
	Mr & Mrs P & J Whitehurst						
PO1473	Mrs G Armstrong				Object	As a resident of Moorland Road since 1975, I write to you to express my concerns over the appalling plan to yet again to destroy an area of the town much loved and frequented by its residents for countless generations. I can assure you that the contents of the letter not only reflect the views of me and the residents of moorland road and Kniveden Lane but those of leek in general. The proposal to build 400 houses on the Mount came as a shock to the town. Whilst I am not opposed to the idea of providing some housing In the Leek area, I cannot equate with the requirement for the number your department are planning. As regards the location, how can you say that a beautiful location like the Mount is in need of development when there are numerous locations that in the area that are an eyesore and would be more than fit the bill for re development? If your department were to take the time too canvas the people of leek you would find that it is considered an asset to this town. The Mount is an area of outstanding rural beauty with great views across the town, supporting an abundance of wildlife whose habitat would be	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						destroyed if the plan goes ahead. It has long been a source of relaxation, leisure, exercise, and even welcomes retreats for courting couples and families with children or people exercising their pets can be seen walking the Mount in complete safety without the fear of being subjected to danger from large numbers of cars. This would change if the whole scheme goes ahead. Is it right that future generations should be denied the pleasure their forebears derived from this beautiful road, With an average of each household owning 2 cars each the pain to build 400 residents could unleash about 800 vehicles all trying to support those numbers. Mount road would be saturated with vehicles all trying to leave either via the junction with the A523 Ashbourne Road or the A53 Buxton Road. Both roads are very busy main roads. After frustration of accessing these knock on effect would choke the town centre which struggles now at certain times to maintain a smooth flow. No doubt the un adapted and unmade section of Kniveden Lane would be upgraded encouraging it to be used as a short cut between Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road. The only thing that stops it being a rat track now is that it is unmade and has ruts and pot holes. Also of concern is that with this sort of development you re require to provide a proportion for social housing. We all know who are housed in these and what effect it has on the surrounding area. I need say no more. Can you explain why there seems determination within the planning bodies to destroy what is beautiful and precious to the people of Leek with total disregard to the preservation of the environment and wishes of the Leek populace. If they want to improve this town why don't they concentrate on some off those areas in dire need of redevelopment and of which there are many in this town. I along with the majority of the other house owners in the vicinity, share at the lack of the thought the has obviously not being thought that has gone into this project. I ask the question; have any of the councillors or those on the planning dep actually bothered to walk to location, to see for themselves what they would be destroying and ask residents for their thoughts. No, I doubt it very much if this is the case.is it just a figure on the map to them? I understand that the majority are not from leek and so don't really have its best interests at heart. These so called councillors were voted in to represent the towns folk and listen to their view. This has not obviously been thought out thoroughly and it makes me wonder what sort of people will be running the council. Is it yet again something to their advantage and not that of the town. Their priorities do not appear to be the people of leek there to represent them. I make this representation not only on behalf of those directly affected but also the people of leek who are totally opposed to this desecration of one of the most beautiful and well-loved areas.	the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. See para response to PO1352 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1521	Ms Angie Guest				Object	Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2 nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about public rights of way • See para response to PO90 about highways
PO1691	Mrs C Wainscott				Object	We write to reinforce grave concerns regarding the development of these 2 sites. LE127 and LE128a Firstly our primary objection to these 2 sites being development for housing is the impact of the traffic movements along mount road which would inevitably result. We have been residents on Mount Road for 47 years and during that time I have seen a significant increase in the usage of this road which has become somewhat of a rat run linking the main A53 Leek to Buxton Road with the A523 to Ashbourne Road. It hardly needs us to remind the local authority of the tragic road traffic accident a few years ago and this resulted in loss of life of a pedestrian following a collision with a vehicle and the regular use on the roads for recreational walks by many residents of leek coupled with preposterous 60mph speed limit already creates a recipe for further incidents. Further to the junctions connecting mount road to the A53 and A523 are already of poor standard with limited visibility when emerging particularly onto the A53 opposite novi lane. Secondly the area of Mount Road currently provides a buffer between existing development and open countryside and valuable interface between the 2, which is conveniently located to provide a much enjoyed amenity to many local amenities to many local residents who enjoy the tranquillity of the area for its beauty. From the planning policy perspective we understand that Governmental priority is given to brownfield site for future development and as Leek still exhibits the remnants of its industrial past with numerous redundant mills and industrial site still undeveloped it is hard to fathom how the logic that suggests the prominent greenfield site on mount road adjacent to open countryside should be developed in preference to multiple redundant industrial site in the area could ever be defended. We respectfully request therefore that the above concerns are considered by the local authority when deciding on the appropriateness for housing development of sites LE127 and LE128a for inclusion in the emerging SMDC local plans	• See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1568	Miss Sheldon	L			Object	I wish to object the proposed development on Mount Road for the following reasons: Serious damage to the natural habitat of endangered wildlife changing the entire environment forever. Increase traffic would cause major traffic issues not only cause major issues on the Mount itself but having a knock on effect on the town where congestion is already a issues. For generations the Mount has been a popular venue for walker's biker's families in general. It has provided a safe and pleasant environment and giving access to some of the finest views across Leek and Staffordshire Moorlands.	• See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence
PO1556	Mrs Webster	G			Object	I have never protested before but I feel compelled to write this let reg the proposed developments across the mount. When I was young I lived on Haregate Est and many times my parents took my siblings and I across the mount it was something we enjoyed seeing all the farm animal and wildlife. As I got older I would still walk the mount and dream of one day owning one of the houses which were only a couple of minutes' walk away from being in the countryside. That dream was realised in 1976. Now I am retired it is wonderful to be able to stroll round the mount each day. My husband twice a day come rain or shine, and able to do just that take in the views or have conversations with people we meet, not just from this area but from other parts of town. It is good for the soul as well as the mind. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is precious and should be protected for future generations 'never know what you have got till it's gone' comes to mind as was the case with what was a beautiful roundabout which stood proud at the top off Derby St. Do we need so many more houses in leek if so we do not build on the field opposite the cricket club on Macclesfield Road which would not have the catastrophic impact of hundreds of houses on the mount or why not build them on Blackshaw Moor where there is already a small estate. I hope this marvellous asset treasured by so many can be saved for the town and the people of Leek.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt Blackshaw Moor is identified as a 'smaller village' in the Council's emerging Local Plan and should only attract a limited amount of additional housing within or around the built up area. Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.
PO1551	Mr Sinclair	P			Object	Would like to object to the development of the 350+homes on sites across the Mount. The area is used by lots of people walkers, families with young and older children dog walkers, cyclist, runners, horse riders, all enjoying the wonderful views over the Leek, which has been enjoyed for many years. I've been coming around the mount since I moved to leek in the late 60's, building more houses will mean the loss of this lovely scenery for ever. Also the health & safety factors of all these extra cars 600-700 trying to get out at either end of the mount, onto the Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road which is already busy without adding additional traffic. Then pollution of the air	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development.
PO1545	Mrs C Keates				Object	The Mount is a very important area for the town of leek. This whole area is an important amenity area for the town – it was promised a few years ago that there will be no further development after the completion of Mountside gardens. Further developments' will destroy the open views of the Morridge from the town. Some of the areas highlighted for development was gifted to the town presumably to protect them and for agricultural use. Development of the Mount will lead to greatly increased traffic on what is basically a country lane. Safety issues at both junctions. The importance of the local people who use it. Young walkers, runners, joggers, cyclist, horse riding, dog walkers. These include singles, couple. Family groups and organised walking groups aside. We urge you to look at these plans very carefully before you decide to ruin this beautiful area. Surely there are other smaller areas which could be utilized for future needs.	- See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. - See para response to PO90 about highways - See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1540	Mr B Day						
PO1491	Ms Dawn Garrett				Object	I write with reference to the planning proposals along The Mount in Leek. I moved to Leek last August, the countryside being one of the big draws. I'm dismayed to find that my favourite dog walk is earmarked for extensive development. The absolutely magnificent views would be lost forever. The birdsong drowned out by the inevitable increased traffic load. The wildflowers at the side of the road and the sheep peacefully grazing, all gone. The creeping urbanisation of such a lovely country town is a big worry. Surely it would be better environmental sense to deal with the falling-down mills and derelict housing in the town before building any further? Regeneration is a much more modern concept and would further revitalise the town itself. For me and my family access to the views, the fresh air and the wildlife is balm against our stressful and hectic working lives. I live on Ashbourne Road so this is not NIMBYism at work, it is a genuine plea to save this lovely area for everyone. Now and in the future.	- See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO90 about highways - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1582	Mr C Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I love to go running there with my dad and really enjoy the view into open countryside.	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1592	Mr Emerick	L			Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected. My family often take our dog for walks there and feel it should be protected	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence
PO1598	Mrs Smith	J					
PO1693	Ms Machin	K			Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on the mount road, leek as outlined in the preferred options site and boundaries of staffs moorlands local plans – sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. This area should not be built on as it will ruin the lovely views over Leek and the Horizon and has been enjoyed for generations by walker's cyclist etc, who on a nice day vastly outnumber cars on this stretch of road. This road also appears to be outside the site boundary. By building approx. 400 houses it will no longer be a country walk yet another housing est. The council should be committed to maintaining green belt land and encouraging people to get fresh air and exercise in an age increasing obesity. There are surely plenty of empty mills and brownfield or former industrial sites within the town which could be developed for housing instead of building on open fields. There is also no development proposed in the west end of leek-why not? The planners need to go back to their drawing board and identify more suitable sites across the whole leek instead of concentrating on the one unsuitable area. Please save the mount	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO192 about public rights of way - See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1707	Mr Hoggarth	C			Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A I am writing to you with regards to you with my objection to the proposed sites above for housing development that I consider will result in loss of countryside and a recreational amenity to local residents. My objections consist of 3 main concerns: The loss of green field sites. The enclosure of the open space that is mount road. The loss of recreational amenity of Mount Road through the amount of additional traffic. The areas of land in question is border Mount Road, a low traffic route with broad open views across countryside to the east over the town of Leek and beyond to its west. Mount Road well known locally for the pleasurable route for exercise it provides and is much used by local residents and visitors. Enclosure with housing development would turn an open country lane into just another urban roadway and would destroy the views reducing the attraction of the area. The associated increase in the traffic would severely reduce the safety route. I consider that the cumulative effect would be to destroy the area as a recreational amenity. Of the area surrounding the current town boundaries, I think that this is one that would constitute the greatest loss, both with respect to the beauty of the outlook and the loss of its use for recreation. Mount Road is a beautiful location; visitors jealously comment how lucky I am to have such an area on my doorstep. To destroy it would be a disgrace and I hope you will reconsider the proposals	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO90 about highways - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1704	Mrs J McGuinness				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A. As a local resident in objection to the above proposed plans For the Mount in Leek. I object to the scale of development for this beautiful country lane on the outskirts of our town. It is a area of outstanding beauty, boasting much wildlife, flora and fauna. The woodland and hedgerows are home to valued wildlife and birds. In addition there are farm animals, bats, foxes, stoats, mice all of which inhabit this area has been identified over existing brownfield sites in town. Could the planners not relax the rules and allow sites in town that have been previously been refused for development? Do we really need 400 houses? Do we really need another 1 st school, at this end of the town? I am dubious as there are as many properties in the town already for sale, unoccupied or derelict. Where are all the people coming from to buy these 400 houses? My main objection is the sheer volume of traffic. The roads are totally unsuitable to accommodate the amount of traffic that's will be generated by a school and 400 houses. This development has the potential to create at least 800 cars from the proposed housing development (average 2 cars per house hold) and even more generated from schools with staff and pupils, including the cars school buses . The lane is already suffers from many vehicles using the lane, as a rat run and this will increase. In addition to being a resident The Mount I am also a daily dog walker and I am concerned for the safety of those using the lane for leisure, i.e walker, dog walkers, joggers, mums with little ones, cyclists, horse riders and those coming to sit on the seats provided to take in the beautiful views. If development goes ahead these activities will come to an end and once again our green landscape will disappear with the town boundaries being pushed out further and further. Where will local people be able to go without getting into these cars and causing more traffic congestion on the roads, and what about those without transport? The road junction at either end of the Mount are not without difficulties. The Buxton Road junctions Is a staggered cross roads with Novi Lane and needs to be approached with caution. At school times It is used by parents/carers/school buses. I cannot imagine the chaos that will transpire if another school is permitted on the Mount – it will certainly become a lot busier and more dangerous. Do we really want to put our children at risk? Walking to and from school will not be a solution as it will be to dangerous. Let us not forget that in additions to this road junction, a short distance down the same road Churnet View transport comes onto the Buxton Road via Abbotts Road, and Leek High/The Meadows/East St 1 st School all feed into and use Buxton Road via Springfield Road. Each school has buses/taxis and cars transporting pupils and the volume using the roads at the same time of day has potential to cause bottle necks on this busy main road. Another school shall mean 7 school all using the same road – local residents will have to keep of the road to the volume of traffic down. The other end of the mount leads to Ashbourne road and this junction not only has obscured visual	It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						access but a difficult angled junction. Surely this is totally unsuitable to transport large volumes of traffic which will be generated from 400 houses and a school! If a alternative junction is proposed this can only be achieved by sacrificing another green field. The Mount, Ashbourne Road are all used by big lorries, buses, tractors, trailers, farm stock to and from stock market, farm machinery, lorries transporting goods to and from Buxton, Ashbourne, and Surrounding areas. These are very busy roads! Can we really add to this without causing major problems? I urge the council to consider these proposals very carefully giving due time and consideration to alternative sites in town, because once the boxes are ticked it will be irreversible and the mount will be changed forever.	
PO1739	Mr Martin Armstrong				Object	LE127, LE128A, LE142A, LE142B Why turn a place of beauty into an eyesore when the council should be concentrating on transforming areas which are an eyesore into places of beauty. There are so many alternatives to the proposed sites for housing development around leek is without having to take away Leeks most cherished leisure route. Mount Road has long been a source of relaxation, leisure and exercise to the residents of Leek It is used daily by scores of locals who walk, run, cycle, and enjoy the tranquillity of this country lane which provides fantastic views across Leek and towards the peak district. Where else in the area is there such an amenity so conveniently within walking distance and safe for people to enjoy. The Mount is also a natural habitat for wildlife including many endangered species. The like of owls, woodpeckers and many more other birds and small mammals would be severely put to risk and their habitat will be seriously damaged. This proposed totally unnecessary housing development would not only destroy all this but also a place extra stress on the town centre already, struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra vehicles would adversely affect road safety and be a danger to the public particularly on both exits from Mount Road. These are but a few of the issues generated by this ill thought out scheme	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2585	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2907	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	The allocations proposed around Mount Road will necessitate highway improvements for example road widening, provision of footways, completing Kniveden Lane to adoptable standard, possible (probable) junction improvements at one or both ends. The removal of the sites between LE127 and LE128a could make the delivery of the required scheme more complicated and therefore requires further consideration including the reinstatement of sites LE069 & LE128b.	Comments noted. See para response to PO90 about highways. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount are not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3657	Mr P Ash				Object	My husband and I most strongly oppose the number of sites on Mount Road, Leek as preferred option for new homes. Both of us have lived in Leek all our lives and for the past 50 years have resided on the Moorland Road. Mount Road is acknowledged as an area of open space for walking, cycling, and jogging and it is a area of free from volumes of traffic? I know my mother exercised, pushing me in my pram walking round the Mount. Building houses either side of the road would most likely make the Mount Road into a main road linking Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road. This road is not sustainable not wide enough to take heavy vehicles and constant stream of Traffic, if numerous houses were to be built either side for Health and Safety reason would require pavements, gutters and drainage all of which will narrow, the width of the road for vehicles, in all probability each house will have 2 cars, which again will increase the flow of traffic. To surface the top of Kniveden lane would make this road a rat race and a highway leading to an increase of even more traffic may I remind the council that when the developers applied for planning permission to build homes on the land behind sunny view at the end of Ashbourne Road – grave concern was exposed by Staffordshire County Council of traffic from the houses converging onto a busy main road, would that not also apply to traffic from the houses converging onto 2 main roads – Ashbourne road,, and at the other end of Buxton road. I would like to draw your attention to the fact when Mr William Milnes gave the land he owned to the council, land where now stands Leek High School, and is playing fields which borders Kniveden Lane and extend on the Mount, there was a clause in the gift of land that this land would be only used for educational purposes. One may also ask the council “where are all families and buyers that require these houses? Leek has not the facilities to accommodate such a huge increase in its population. The Dr's are already working to their full capacity, which schools primary and senior have places for an increase in children of school age? And where will the new comers to the area, travelling from the Mount to Macclesfield or to the potteries will increase the flow of traffic though the centre of the town these were problems with planning permission to build house on ?? At Leek brook on the site of Joshua Wardens factory, as to the nature of the ground and the fact the earth may have become contaminated from factory work etc. These problems were overcome and rectified and houses were built. Now houses cannot build on this land surrounding Sainsbury's Supermarket because of problems with the land – if land at Leekbrook can overcome the problems with the land around Sainsbury's overcome the problem? And houses can be built on land previously occupied and accommodating buildings.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways The Council is not aware of any legal encumbrances upon this site. • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO674 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer. • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4724	Mr D And L Robinson				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a Central Government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself is the site allocated off Mount Road, Leek. At present most of the estates west of Mount Road are below the crest of the Mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of High View Road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along High View Road and Moorland Road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the Town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the Southern and Western flank of Leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the Mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	• See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1352 about streetlighting • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO90 about highways
PO4733	Mr M Turnock						
PO4729	Miss CM Hambleton						
PO4720	Mr RP kerr						
PO4739	Mr W Trafford						
							Note that vehicular access to LE127 is anticipated off Mount Road; SCC Higwhays response was predicated on this. The Council would assess residential schemes in proximity to approved wind turbines in accordance with Core Strategy and NPPF amenity Policies, and ETSU (as amended) noise criteria etc. • See para response to PO125 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO674 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response in PO700 about utilities and flood risk

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3943	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP			Support	[See Location Plan attached to Question 1]. [Letter attached to representation, stating:] Land at Mount Road, Leek Firstly, it should be noted that Renew Land Developments Limited are aware of third party opposition to potential housing development of land at Mount Road, Leek. Many objections to the proposed allocations object to the principle of development, in addition to other site specific matters such as visual impact, highways, drainage, biodiversity, etc. This representation comments on these various matters in turn. Principle of Allocating Land to the East of Leek for Housing Development The bulk of housing allocations suggested for Leek are proposed to the east of the town. The principle of allocating sites in this general area is supported for a number of reasons as set out below. Firstly, with regard to the principle of such an allocation, the LPA, in accordance with national policy, has to allocate a sufficient number of suitable, available and deliverable housing sites in order to ensure that objectively assessed housing needs can be addressed over the plan period. Failure to do so would render the Local Plan unsound at examination. Secondly, Leek is one of the largest towns across the District, so should be taking a significant proportion of the overall housing requirement because it already has significant infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the needs of additional development. Thirdly, if development needs are to be met, then sites outside of the existing settlement boundaries will be required to meet additional housing needs. The LPA has already confirmed that it will be conducting a Green Belt Review as part of the current Local Plan process. If the LPA is having to review its Green Belt boundaries around rural settlements and other towns, then Leek cannot be excluded from that process. Fourthly, much opposition to the proposed allocation of land currently designated as open countryside to the east of Leek is founded on the assumption that other previously developed sites are available. The site options consultation does identify a number of infill sites within the boundary of Leek, and many of these are former mill buildings or other vacant industrial or employment sites. However, these sites would not be sufficient on their own to meet the overall development requirements for Leek. Fifthly, land to the west of Leek is currently designated as Green Belt, and land to the north and west of the town is constrained as a result of them being located in areas at risk of flooding. Land to the south of the town is also covered by public open spaces / playing fields, as well as a large golf course, which limits development opportunities in these areas further. The above views are supported by the LPA, who state that: The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). The west side of Leek is Green Belt and the study recommends that housing development should not take place on this side of the town to avoid adverse impacts. This means that sites at the	Comments in support of this site, and clarification of landowner position, noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						eastern side of the town (which is not within the Green Belt) require consideration to meet Leek's future development needs. The Council is required to meet its housing needs to 2031 and there are not enough brown field sites in Leek to achieve this so the Council needs to consider both brownfield and green field sites. In light of the above considerations, it is considered that land to the east of Leek, including land at Mount Road, is considered to be a suitable location for housing development. Visual Impact The Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment identifies land to the west of Mount Road to sit below the ridge line that is situated further to the east of the town and outside of any area identified as having an "important landscape setting to the settlement". The sites at Mount Road otherwise adjoin the urban area and would be viewed in the context of the built form of the town, rather than as an isolated residential development. Highways The four parcels of land proposed as Draft Potential Allocations and Draft Reserve Sites are located to the west of Mount Road, and each site could be accessed directly off Mount Road. Site LE128A could also be potentially accessed off Kniveden Lane to the north (subject to further detailed investigations, and a secondary access to site LE127 could potentially be provided off Thornfield Avenue / High View Road. Any development of this site could facilitate the wider improvement of the local highway network as a result of developer contributions. Mount Road is part of a longer distance walking route and the site is located within 500 metres of local bus stops and is within a reasonable distance to primary and secondary education, such as Leek First School and Leek High School. Otherwise, the site is considered to be located in an accessible location. The supporting documentation provided with the current consultation states that " County Highways do not raise any issues which would prevent development of this site ". It is therefore concluded that access is achievable, and subject to further detailed design work, would not be a constraint to delivering housing on this site. Drainage The site is located within flood zone 1, and has a low risk of fluvial flooding compared with land to the north and west of Leek, which has a much higher risk of flooding. There have also been few recorded incidents of sewer flooding in the surrounding area as confirmed by the Council's own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. In light of the above conclusions, drainage or flood risk is unlikely to be a constraint to the development of this site. Biodiversity As part of the evidence base, the Council has commissioned a phase 1 ecological study of the district. Within this study, the sites have been studied and have been grouped into three parcels. The three land parcels in the study are identified as 35, 39, and 40. All three sites were identified as having very low biodiversity value overall, comprising of species poor improved grassland, scattered scrub and poor hedgerow. The study recommends vegetation clearance at the appropriate time of year, and in the case of site 35, a bat survey of an existing outbuilding to the east.	

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE128 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						In light of the supporting evidence, it is concluded that biodiversity or the presence of protected species would not be a constraint to the development of land to the east of Mount Road. Conclusion Knights are making representations on behalf of Renew Land Developments Limited who are promoting their interest in land to the east of Mount Road for housing development. The site is being promoted by a willing landowner and a willing developer and is otherwise technically deliverable. It is concluded that all of the land to the east of Mount Road, as shown on the attached plan by Renew Land Developments Limited, should be developed. The site is located in open countryside, but not Green Belt, and the site is required to meet the open market and affordable housing needs of Leek given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and infill sites within the existing settlement are severely limited, and other areas of the town are constrained because of Green Belt, Flood Risk or because of landscape sensitivity. The council's own evidence base supports the potential allocation of land to the east of Mount Road. Leek is a large town at the top of the settlement hierarchy for the District, and cannot be excluded from helping to meet the housing requirement for the area. The release of land for housing on the eastern side of Leek is justified by the evidence base, and there are limited alternative options elsewhere around the town. The proposed release of land to the west of Mount Road through the Local Plan is therefore supported. The allocation the site would therefore ensure that the Council has a Local Plan that is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Trust that this letter is clear in expressing our supportive views of the Local Plan and the proposed allocation of land at Mount Road, Leek for housing development. Otherwise, Renew Land Developments support the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement to 320 dwellings per annum.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3693	Mrs Ryan	C			Object	I am writing to express my objection to recently published plans to build on a large area of the Mount in Leek. Whilst understanding there is a need for some new housing, I feel this area is the wrong place and definitely too extensive. A few points I would like to share which may not take into account the professional opinion but a certainly take a common sense view. The Sainsbury's site was passed as a area for retail and business development with a to build on a small housing estate. This has not been fully developed and I understand it may because there are issues with asbestos and or some other contamination. Yet it seems it is fit for a pub selling food, a children's party play area and a supermarket selling some other consumable goods. If it is the case that there have been some bad decisions made around this site, the council officers responsible for passing this plan should own up and ensure this site is cleaned up. Enabling the plans many locals objected to, be completed. Of course this will mean a cost to the taxpayers whom are left carrying the financial burden of bad decisions made. I have no objection Education Land boarding Mount Road being to extend or build a primary school as have a shortage of places, the concern would be of increased traffic and the requirement for good provision of off road parking at the school if there were to be an entrance on that road. There is a site on the Buxton road Blackshaw Moor which has stood unused for many years since the Army ceased training there. It must have drainage, electrics and water on this site. This would be ideal for a small scale affordable housing site. It would also benefit the local school which has a small numbers of pupils and probably in danger of being closed in years to come Transport should not be a issue because there some buses to Buxton and local bus companies can benefit by providing peak time services. There must be other sites within Leek area suitable for developing. I tried to locate brownfield site on SMDC website but it shows many wordy documents but nothing is clearly stating where these sites lie. This could be my ineptitude but there could be more clarity for the lay person on these issues Building in such a large scale on The Mount would devalue housing already there. This may be viewed as a narrow minded but many people have worked hard and taken out huge loans to secure there desired homes. To effect there in such a drastic way I think is unfair and unnecessary. Most of the housing is currently at the higher end of the market and build social or low cost housing amongst this could be problematic from all prospective. If housing is built at the current level at these sites then who shall benefit those on low paid jobs, where I understand the most need is there are many units built as affordable part share homes unsold and many more privately owed sites of apartments etc. standing empty in Leek.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO3657 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1556 about Anzio Camp • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4696	Mr And Mrs C and P Deighton				Object	We are writing to register our very deep concern about the proposal to build on the land at the Mount in Leek. Those involved in the making such decisions do not all live in Leek and probably unaware of the enormous importance of The Mount to the people living around it in Leek. The implications of losing this much loved countryside walk are very serious, and far reaching. The close proximity of The Mount to the homes of so many local people means that it is a place used regularly, often daily, for exercise and relaxation, and is vital to their health and mental well-being. A large number of local residents are elderly, and often unable to drive: there are young families who cannot afford a car: there are several care homes that residents come for walks with their careers. What make The Mount so important is that is so very close to people. It offers beautiful views across the fields and means that people, who cannot get out into the countryside further away, can still enjoy seeing the birds and animals here only just a small walk from where they live. People walking their dogs have a natural means of contact and conversation with others – so important especially for those who live alone. To sum up, we all be deeply distressed to lose this place. So many have been walking there all through their lives, the disruption, and seeing the gradual destruction of a cherished part of their lives will bring an increased sense of isolation, and the feeling of depression faced by those in their later years as they become less able to things without outside help. Having the ability to step outside and walk in open surroundings without having to ask for a lift means a lot to someone struggling to retain their independence and enjoyment for life. To build on The Mount is clearly not necessary. There are as we have all been made aware recently, many alterations for example: various Brown Field sites empty buildings such as factories and offices: disused mills, empty houses apparently unoccupied for long periods. In view of the very unpopular bad decisions made, and the continuing loss of trust in the judgement made and continuing loss of and motives, of the planning department many now suspect that the decisions are influenced mainly by financial incentives from Government or other sources. We do not know whether this is true, but it seems obvious to us that a prompt decision to abandon the idea of building The Mount would bring peace of mind to many Leek Residents and go a long way to restoring the publics belief that members of the Planning Department actually do care about, and will respond to, consider and respect the views, the well-being and even the happiness, of the town they responsible for looking after, both now and the future.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3935	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG			Object	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1] which states: The proposed urban extension to the east of the town...- LE127(100), LE128a(47), LE140(63), LE142a(140) and LE142b(40). The proposed extension also accommodates draft reserve sites LE069(42), LE128b(48) and LE066(50). These sites contribute a significant proportion of the proposed housing for Leek. The allocation of these sites, ahead of available brownfield/previously developed sites, is not in compliance Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy, which sets out the overarching strategy for development in Leek. ...None of the proposed allocations are considered likely to come forward in the short term based on the findings set out in the SHLAA (2015). However, we suggest that the allocation of sites which are deliverable within the short term should have been considered to a greater extent in formulating the preferred options due to the significant shortfall of housing delivery across the district. WYG consider that sites in Leek, such as LE243, are suitable to contribute to the short term delivery of housing in Staffordshire Moorlands. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the draft potential allocations weighs heavily on this eastern stretch of agricultural land and it is noted that no potential allocations have been selected within the core urban area.	Refer to Council response to PO3934 under LE127 table Question 10. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO4825	Mrs L Scragg				Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO90 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4705	Mr and Mrs A & N Waterhouse				Object	Building 400+ houses on the area known by everyone as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gate way to the countryside would be against everything that "localism" would bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and it's unrivalled and area as a whole acts as a buffer, between the town and the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra houses would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and junctions at either end of The Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work, use the Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield Road with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek Town Centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for houses thereby saving this precious area for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements
PO5885	Ms Linda M Beighton				Object	I am writing to object to the proposed plan to allocate the following sites along Mount Road for housing: LE127, LE128a, and LE142a. Mount Road is used by hundreds of people every day of the week as a safe, sustainable leisure route something the council should be encouraging not removing. The current road for much of its length is too narrow for 2 cars to pass. Development would cause urbanisation & widening with the potential destruction of mature trees and dry stone walls. Exits particularly onto Ashbourne Road are already problematic and would need expensive, major work to cope with the extra traffic. People occupying houses at the moment would in the main work on the western side of the town in Cheshire-Manchester and Stoke. Major supermarkets are in the western side of town. Daily trips would further exacerbate the congestion which already chokes Leek. So many houses would destroy what is designated a special landscape area. They would impact on the views from the Peak Park and destroy an amenity area. Extending the own boundary to accommodate the proposed sites is undesirable. Using green field's sites may be expected and enable larger profits for developers but there are still brown field sites and infill land available within the moorlands district.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1352 about tree protection • See para response to PO674 on design • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9100	Ms S Naisbett				Object	I am writing to strongly object to the councils draft plan to build on the following area along Mount Road in Leek, Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 There are many other brown field sites in Leek such as Foker Grange and Home Farm that are available for development, and where houses could be built. Surely these sites should be used first for any planned housing development. The area along Mount Road should remain as it is. Beautiful open green fields. There should be no need to build further homes in the green belt of Leek when there are approximately 1,170	• See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						homes that are currently empty in the Staffordshire Moorlands, and an additional 2500 homes for sale. Leek is a Market Town, and this is its great appeal to the people who live here, and also to those who travel to the town to shop, as well as tourists who come to visit. If the town keeps growing due to more and more houses being built, it will no longer be an attractive historic market town, it will become a very large town centered around housing, and if the building continues year on year it will eventually result in Leek becoming a modern day city. Mount Road is a wonderful area of natural beauty that is also very educational for young children. My daughter and I often walk along Mount Road because she likes to be surrounded by the green open fields and the nature it holds. She loves seeing and learning about the different types of wild flowers, butterflies, wildlife and farm animals we see in the fields along Mount Road. If houses were built on Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 there would be nowhere locally for children who live in the area to experience this kind of nature and wildlife. Mount Road is also an extremely popular place for walkers, joggers, and cyclists, because it is currently a very quiet area, (has low noise pollution), and also has few vehicles currently passing through it, hence is an area with low levels of air pollution. The green open spaces make it a very relaxing area, with wonderful views. If 380 houses were to be built in the area, it is estimated that over 750 more cars will be travelling along Mount Road on a daily basis, causing high levels of noise pollution and high levels of air pollution to the area. Thus making it a noisy, unhealthy, stressful area to walk, jog etc. This could lead to less people in the area going for walks etc/carrying out physical exercise .This goes against government efforts encourage people to be active and get fitter in order to fight against illness and obesity, e.g fit for life, and yet the Council is planning to build on a green field area which is ridiculous. Wildlife will be lost if houses are built on Mount road. My friends and I have seen wide variety of wild animals in the fields along Mount Road including wild rabbits, hedgehogs,badgers and buzzards. These areas of wildlife would be lost of houses were built here. The roads in the town are extremely busy with traffic. This makes them unsafe for young children to ride their bikes and scooters along. Mount Road is located on the very edge of town, and due to the current low traffic levels of traffic, this makes it an ideal area for children to safely ride their scooters and bikes. If 380 houses were built along Mount Road the road would become extremely busy with traffic making it another road which is not safe for young children to ride their bicycles. Question why don't disused buildings in Leek such as old mills be converted to affordable housing for young people, instead of allowing of 3, 4 or five bedroom luxury homes to be built along Mount Road- which is what developers will build along areas LE127a; LE128a; LE140. An example of this are the houses built relatively recently by Amos Group on land adjacent to Mount Road which were priced at over £230,000 each. All of the above reasons clearly	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about air quality • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing • See para response to PO125 about heritage impact considerations The Council maintains a database of housing site suggestions (SHLAA). This database formed the basis of the 2015 'Site Options' consultation as all SHLAA sites above a minimum size threshold, and attracting a 'B' deliverability rating, were included in that consultation. Subsequently 2016 'Preferred Options' were narrowed down from this. Note that Home Farm LE138 attracted a 'C' deliverability rating.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						show why the area along Mount Road Reference number should not be built on.	
PO9143	Mr Ramon West				Object	We wish to object to the 4 preferred housing allocation sites on the Mount, Leek. It would be an outrage to proceed with residential development on any of these sites: LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a. The Council must take into consideration: Loss of local amenity - the Mount is a popular amenity enjoyed and cherished by walkers, joggers, cyclists, nature-lovers and dog-walkers. There is no comparable open countryside leisure amenity so close to the town centre. There is no comparable alternative within easy walking distance on the east side of town. Loss of such amenity would have an adverse effect on the health and wellbeing of a great many local people. Visual impact - the Mount is a classic example of outstanding moorland scenery. It provides unique and wonderful views over the town and beyond. Leek prides itself, and markets itself, as the Queen of the Moorlands. If this is to mean anything, the Council must do everything it can to halt the expansion of the town into the surrounding countryside and work to preserve the proximity and integrity of some of our finest moorlands scenery. Impact on infrastructure - hundreds of new houses will bring thousands of people. Nearby schools and GP surgeries will be put under further strain. Council services, social services and emergency services are already all under great strain. Traffic problems will be made worse. The future - the population of Leek is predicted to rise by a few thousand over the next couple of decades or so. This is mainly due to an ageing population. We are living longer. That means more of the people who are living here now will still be around in 20 or 30 years time. Therefore, planning for the future should be focused on local services for local people. We hope that the Council will heed our objections and explore alternative approaches to housing needs and development in our town. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to the 'Bimby Housing Toolkit' which was drawn up by the Prince's Foundation for Building Community (bimby.org.uk).	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note these assess the needs of 'older people' and other groups. The June 2014 SHMA concluded the number and proportion of older person households is expected to increase in the District over the period to 2031 (46% increase between 2011 and 2031) which has implications such as increased demand for both specialist/extra-care accommodation for older people, and for adaptable homes. Owing to an ageing population and other factors, the need for smaller units will in future exceed the need for larger, family units. For these reasons the SHMA recommends that 60% of future housing should be 1- or 2-bed. The Council's current Core Strategy Policies expect larger housing schemes to provide for a mix of housing across all locations, to respond to identified local needs such as housing for older people. Note that where there is a policy requirement for affordable housing provision upon such sites, the nature of provision may reflect the above. The BIMBY toolkit is noted. The Council will continue to work with communities

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							seeking to introduce (or influence the preparation of) Neighbourhood Plans, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.
PO9088	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9063	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick				Object	I am writing to put forward my opposition to the building of houses on Mount Road in Leek. It upsets me greatly to think that an important local amenity could be lost forever if these proposals go ahead. "The Mount" as we fondly know it, is a valuable asset to the East side of Leek, a wonderful place to take our families for walks and bike rides. In our busy lives, it is vital for our health, both mental and physical to have somewhere to go to relax and unwind. What better place than a walk along the Mount with views over Bradnop and Morridge, so accessible from our homes. If the fields in the planning proposals-LE127, LE128, LE140 and most worryingly on the opposite side LE142 were to be built on then the landscape of our beautiful town will be lost forever. For those arriving in to Leek from Ashbourne Road, they would be met with yet another sprawling housing estate, replacing the picturesque fields full of animals that are so welcoming to see. The road will become a main thoroughfare from the Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road and will lose its charm for us all. Lets protect the gateway to LEEK for generations to come. SAVE THE MOUNT.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence
PO9058	Mr Terence Gee				Object	I wish to object to the proposal to build housing on sites LE127,LE128,LE140,LE142a on mount road. This is a green field site with a rural road with unspoilt views only five minutes walk from Pick wood avenue. This road is used regularly by myself and often meet other walkers, cyclists in the area. Also the road would have extra traffic for 500 houses with poor access. There would be increased pressure on local schools,doctors,etc and I feel it would spoil the area with increased urbanisation.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE128 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9071	Mr Stewart Johnson				Object	I am writing to protest against the proposed plans to build 4000 houses in the Leek area:- 1, question how many unoccupied properties are there in the area 2, Loss of beautiful countryside. 3, Work vacancies in the local area. 4, Local infrastructure . 5, Places at local schools. The list is just a few of the considerations the planners seem to be ignoring. Of particular concern is the proposed development along Mount Road. Not only would this destroy a beautiful part of the town used by many residents,it would also cause serious traffic problems both in the immediate vicinity and the rest of the town. These new residents would have to commute,and the main routes would be right through the centre of town adding to an already serious congestion problem. Why do the planners want to destroy the treasure that is The Queen of the Moorlands!	• See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways
PO9078	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9094	Ms Sarah Bishop				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands" , Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"! As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land, before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken in to deep consideration before this gem in the town is lost forever.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9314	Ms Emily Hodgkinson						
PO9405	Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9117	Mr Robert Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. It is also important to note that TOURISM is a significant driver to the local Economy! Therefore the Town Gateway, especially from the PEAK PARK Buxton Road A53, needs rigorous protection from urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of The Moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive and picturesque and is a key Tourist route. It is also a highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who very regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thornccliffe Road and its' adjoining lanes, and The Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horseriding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicing, and general enjoyment for health and wellbeing. The proposal area, particularly as it approaches the A53 Buxton Road junction with Thornccliffe Road and The Mount, is immediately adjacent to the SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its Historic Landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority in its protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is 'Special' in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There are a number of 'brown' sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. [Question why] these are not shown on the accompanying Consultation Maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be "The Preferred Option Housing Sites" in the view of the residents of Leek. There are also pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the Town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thornccliffe Road and The Mount Road is a Major Intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc.. It would put a major strain onto the area and have significantly adverse effects on the locality. The proposal is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the "housing requirement"[queries this as unjustified] along 1 narrow lane at the most Flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the "brown sites" and protect Leek's Heritage and inheritance!	• See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO674 about design policies Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO125 about heritage impact considerations

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9124	Mr Richard Pigott				Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Mount sites: Mount Rd is local amenity LE128 is the most elevated of the sites being considered LE066 is a brownfield site and should be considered ahead of LE128 Concentrating housing allocations on east side of town would raise deliverability problems compared to other areas of town Some western Leek sites in the Green Belt are nevertheless preferable to allocate for housing, than sites at the Mount.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence Note the 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that LE128A and LE128B are of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. Whereas LE066 is assessed of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO35 about viability study
PO9131	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek int his issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total the lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a the lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	
PO9194	Mrs M Motum				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO90 about highways
PO9103	Mr Robert McGuinness				Object	Email with representation form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sites LE127/LE128A/LE140/LE142A and 'School Site' [presumed LE140] alongside 2015 'Options' sites LE066/LE069/LE128B with the following text: Overdevelopment, traffic congestion issues, inadequate infrastructure, inadequate road network. Brownfield sites and redundant mills should be brought into use first.	It is not considered that development of these particular sites would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design and landscape protection policies contained within the new Local Plan, and having regard to the Council's landscape evidence such as the 2016 Landscape Impact study. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that sites LE069 is not included as allocations in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9245 PO9199	Mr John Belfield Mrs Maureen Belfield				Object	The rural fringe of Leek, and specifically Mount Road, would become urbanised. The Mount is a very popular route for leisure activities and exercise for many people and this would be lost. With the enormous number of proposed new houses there would be a massive increase in the amount of traffic both on the mount and also in the surrounding area. Kniveden Lane is already a busy road as it gives access to the small car park at the Moorlands Hospital. This car park is already insufficient for the needs of the hospital and many cars currently park on Kniveden Lane. If hundreds of houses are built on the mount Kniveden Lane would become a significant means of access to Ashbourne Road. The road network would need to be considerably enhanced and part of Kniveden Lane would need to be properly surfaced. This would lead to a major change in traffic patterns in the area which would lead to a loss of public amenity. This would not only cause traffic chaos but would also pollute the surrounding area. It would also make the smaller residential streets of Pitcher Lane and Trafford Close a potential car park for those who currently use Kniveden Lane for this purpose. There are brownfield sites available for building and also more suitable greenfield sites, for example Foker Grange and Home Farm, which have much easier access to the main road network. I therefore object to the building plans on the Mount which are numbered LE142a LE140, LE128a and LE127	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO90 about air quality • See para response to PO9100 about Home farm

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9337	Mr Derek Kay				Object	Herewith are my objections yet again about building proposals affecting open greenbelt land on Mount Road. I strongly object to delinations LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, on the grounds of unnecessary and deleterious incursion into valuable scenic amenities. The fringes of this town (Queen of the Moorlands) must be preserved at all costs. Open aspects across towards the Peak District are essential for our spiritual wellbeing; unwelcome development of additional traffic flow and population density would be the corollary of this building project, were it to succeed. Conversely, there is much brownfield potential within the town boundary itself; rundown old mills for example (which may be protected by outdated listing orders) and other unsightly structures causing blots on the "townscape". Not enough positive action to clean up the interior of this town has been taken over the years. Use compulsory purchase orders where difficult site owners will not cooperate and make the Queen worthy of her name.	• See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Whilst Councils do retain CPO powers in principle, these are generally used (if at all) as a last resort where it is expedient and in the public interest for the Council to do so, where agreement with landowners is not possible. As explained in response to PO192 the Council makes assumptions that development schemes will come forward within the Leek development boundary to contribute to its housing need to 2031, which could include historic premises etc. Applications affecting listed or non-listed "heritage assets" would be assessed against Section 12 NPPF and Council Policies. The Council would also assess schemes in the town centre against the aspirations of the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9237	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water Im concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO678 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO125 about options site assessments • See para response to PO90 about air quality • See para response in PO700 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement The Council must demonstrate to planning inspector that its Local Plan is based on the principles of sustainable development. The NPPF is clear that this means three roles – economic, social, and environmental, and that they are considered simultaneously. The Council's submitted Policies and objectives would therefore have to satisfy this.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	
PO9213	Mrs E Adams				Object	I wish to place my strong objections to the proposals to build house on the mount, leek. It would devastate this beautiful area which benefits tourists and residents alike. Objections also relate to roads, schools, doctors etc. Please please rethink your plans.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence
PO9180	Mrs E Adams				Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained.
PO9251	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1352 about streetlighting

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	
PO9294	Mrs Gwen Gledhill				Object	Re sites LE127,128,140.142a I wish to object strongly to the proposal to make these sites on The Mount available for housing on the following grounds: 1. Traffic The Mount is a narrow country lane with no pavements and little or no street lighting. There are narrow and dangerous junctions at both ends on to the Buxton and Ashbourne roads and a dangerous bend by LE127. The traffic generated by the proposed 400 houses will completely overload these junctions at busy times and generate a major risk to pedestrians on the lane itself, especially as there is not sufficient width for two cars to pass each other for most of the length of the lane. Commuters travelling from these house to Manchester, Macclesfield or Stoke will only add to the town centre traffic congestion at busy times. 2. The Local Housing Need It is well documented that the local need is for starter homes for young people and 'downsizing' homes for older people. These are not required on the edge of town but need to be closer to the centre where there are shops, amenities and better public transport links. Whatever developers initially propose re 'affordable housing' on The Mount, the reality is that they will ultimately build executive homes attractive to commuters travelling to Manchester, Stoke and beyond at prices cheaper than can be found in Cheshire East! I believe that the buyers will not be local people and thus the developments will not answer the local housing need. There are other sites that could address this need to the south and north west of the town and via infill in the centre itself. Planners should look more carefully at these and not settle quickly for 'easier' options. 3 Our Environment The Mount is a long standing area of natural beauty, accessible to most town residents on foot with views equal to those enjoyed across the Peak District. The developments will ruin this aspect and destroy a major, free, leisure experience for local people right on the edge of The Peak District National Park - their officers will (I'm sure) be objecting too!	• See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO9143 about ageing District population • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO125 about options site assessments • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9164	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this. Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO90 about air quality • See para response to PO1352 about tree protection • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	
PO9229	MRS KAREN BARKER				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. There is much greater need for jobs/employment as priority in the town if people are to be enticed to come to live here by large scale housing developments. There are presently not enough jobs locally to adequately provide for the current housing occupants. There is likely to be an increased need for Housing Benefits affecting the local economy together with significant increased pressure on infrastructure due to need for travel in and out of the area for work. It is also important to note tourism is a significant driver to the local economy! Therefore the town gateway, especially from the Peak Park Buxton road A53, needs to be rigorous protection from the urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of the moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive picturesque and Tourist Route. It is also highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thorncliffe Road and its adjoining lanes, the Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horse-riding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicking and general enjoyment of for health and well-being. The proposed areas particularly as it approaches the a53 Buxton Road junction with Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road, is immediately adjacent to a landscape area which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its historic landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is special in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There is a number of brownfield sites within the town	• See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO674 about design policies • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO5885 about special landscape area • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						which could be very effectively used for housing development. For some reason? These are not shown on the accompanying consultation maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be 'the preferred option housing sites' in view of the residents of Leek. There are also pockets of green belt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitively to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road is a major intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc. The proposal will be completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the housing requirement? Unjustified along 1 narrow lane at the most flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the brownfield sites and protect Leek's heritage and inheritance!	
PO9270	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as "Preferred Housing Allocation". There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to be adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners. 5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response in PO700 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	requirements - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
PO9157	Mr Paul Birks				Object	I would like to have recorded my very strong objections to the proposed development of site reference LE128a. I have for many years now enjoyed a lovely, peaceful and relaxing walk along the mount on the edge of Leek. In my humble opinion it is the most beautiful place in all of England and the thought of destroying it is simply abominable! When there are other places even in and around the town of Leek that could be developed instead, I implore you to please drop this crazy scheme immediately! I understand that there is another potential site that you can develop that you have referenced as 'LE066', not to mention the numerous abandoned factories that, though possibly listed, are essentially nothing more than an eyesore waiting for an entrepreneurial company or government body to redevelop in the same mind set as the original builder of the buildings.	- See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. - Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. - See para response to PO9337 on listed buildings

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9173	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	• See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence The NPPF expects Councils to meet objectively assessed development requirements, and also encourages brownfield development, subject to wider Policies. • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9187 PO9257	Ms Michele Rushton Mrs Jane Harrison				Object	I wish to register my disapproval re the above development and quite the following points. Loss of an important local amenity – the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by people across the town. Visual impact - restricting important and highly valued panoramic views across the Leek skyline and further afield. Impact on infrastructure - primary schools in particular (East Street, Beresford) will struggle to keep up with demand and the situation where some children already have to travel to schools in the west of Leek will become more and more common Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging High quality landscape – unsympathetic to the landscape character and quality of the area Urbanisation of the country lane that is Mount Road – if all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The spatial distribution of proposed sites across Leek is unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event The volume and speed of traffic is likely to increase on Kniveden Lane where my family have been residents for over 25years. Please for the sake of Leek and her people, review your proposal. Question where are the jobs to support people buying new houses Traffic & congestion through & around Leek is already critical without the addition of more vehicles. Question why can't brownfield sites/old mills etc be converted to housing · I chose to live near Mount Road because I like it as it is, please do not change it!	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO35 about viability study • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9205	Mr Martin Bagshaw				Object	I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development on the mount area of Leek. I have lived in Leek for all of my life and I and many others , have spent many happy hours enjoying the scenery and tranquility that this area of the town offers to residents of the town. To develop in this area will drastically reduce the local amenity for the residents of the town. It is a lovely picturesque area that is within easy reach of the town centre. And I believe that to destroy it would be an absolute travesty. The area has many amenity uses, such as walking, horse riding, cycling and jogging, let alone just sitting on the benches and chilling. I think the existing schools will struggle to cope with the increased demand for places. The increase the traffic on the roads surrounding the mount will be significant, and traffic calming measures will need to be considered for safety reasons and quality of life of the existing residents in the area. There also be an increase in commuter traffic from this development. I think the majority of which will have to cross the town towards either Stoke on Trent or Cheshire. This will add to the already considerable traffic issues in the town. I believe the Barnfields, the rear of Sainsbury and Foker Grange Farm would be much better locations, so that the increase in traffic is kept away from the town centre. It was my understanding the houses were proposed for the rear of Sainsbury's. But I understand this has hit commercial difficulties with residual contamination.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. • See para response to PO3657 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See response to PO35

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9279	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	• See para response to PO674 about design policies • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement
PO9287	Mr Ian Harrison				Object	I hereby which to object to the building of houses etc on The Mount, Leek. This road, used by many is the last place to admire the scenic views of both Leek and the surrounding areas. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. If one site is given permission for house building, then all others will follow and question where will it end. There must be countless brown field sites in the leek area which can be built on first and foremost. If 500 houses were to be built, what happens to Leek. The jobs aren't there, infrastructure, the existing roads can't cope with todays traffic (constant gridlocks in the town centre, never mind 1000 further cars. No hope of a ring road around leek. Junior schools, can't cope with further numbers of school pupils. My wife and I continue to walk over the mount and admire the scenery, as well as the many more who walk, cycle, run and horse ride over it. The new housing would block the outstanding views people go the the mount to view.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9219	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	• See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9307	Councillor Gail Lockett				Object	I would like to objections to site allocations LE127 and LE128a, these two sites are completely unsuitable for development as the road would not be able to sustain the mount of traffic and the junctions at both end are dangerous, we should be looking at urban infill to distribute the number of houses required.	• See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO125 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9322	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots IE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example, the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance, for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country " walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built. There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important, local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO674 about design policies The emerging Local Plan is not yet finalised and needs to undergo independent public examination by Government appointed Planning Inspector before it can become adopted. Planning applications arising before this happens must be determined against the NPPF and current Council planning policies. • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9348	Mr David Rowe				Object	I am writing to object to the selection of all sites on Mount Road, LE127, LE128, LE140 and LE142a. This road is of great value to local people as a very accessible place to experience and benefit from the surrounding countryside. Many people walk, cycle, exercise their dogs along this road every day, and this would be completely lost if development was allowed to take place. There are several brownfield sites in the town that should be considered instead, e.g. the old mills, Barnfields site.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO9205 about existing industrial areas
PO9330	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is an quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO90 about air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9385	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1473 about affordable housing • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. • See para response to PO125 about 'Options Site Assessments'
PO9300	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9424	Mr Michael Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!! There are loads of other areas in Leek that are within the boundaries of leek and not on green field sites (Huge's Concrete site for one) Leek dose not need this amount of housing there is not the work/jobs for the increase in people. This is all about money in the pocket for the council. If we need another primary school increase extend Beresford Memorial school there is about 3 acres of fields behind the school.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO9205 about existing industrial areas • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO674 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO674 about Leek education requirements.
PO9377	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west side of Leek are developable.	• See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. • Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The map in the Preferred Options consultation document is intended to illustrate proposed allocations and development boundaries and other summary information, not the extent of land ownerships. • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO1146 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence.
PO9370	Councillor Rebecca Done				Object	On the proposed planning for the Mount in Leek..I do not agree with and my reasons are stated below: The Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by a lot of people across the town including myself. There will be a massive impact on infrastructure, I think primary schools in particular would suffer (East Street, Beresford) and will struggle to keep up with demand. Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging. If all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The proposed sites across Leek are unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO674 about educational requirements • See para response to PO674 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO192 about public rights of way • See para response to PO35 about viability study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9390	Ms Claudia Hill				Object	I am very disappointed to hear of the plans to build upon the site known as the Mount in Leek. This area is undoubtedly one enjoyed by all walks of life within Leek and it would be a great shame to destroy it with housing. The views and walks currently enjoyed would be eradicated and this would impact on the wellbeing of the people of Leek. As you can see from this article: http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/a4555184-30c7-11e6-9c43-b579056ef2e5 - published today in the Times: "Nature lovers are more conscientious, emotionally stable and open to new experiences than those addicted to technology, academics claim." Taking away this green land would not be in the interest of the people of Leek. Traffic is also a major problem within Leek. The current infrastructure of roads and schools could not cope with more cars and people, the number of which would undoubtedly augment if new houses were built. There is a lot of opposition to the plans to build on the Mount, and there is no reason for this to go ahead.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9396	Ms Katie Giddings				Object	I wish to register my strong objection to the sites identified for development along The Mount, Leek. The site reference numbers are LE127, LE128, LE140 & LE142a. The Mount is highly valued by the people of Leek. Hundreds of people use it every day & enjoy the landscape and views. These people cover a broad mix - there are walkers & strollers, hikers & joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists - and they range through all ages, from young to old. Generations have taken the air along The Mount and future generations deserve the same opportunity. Chance and regular encounters with this variety of people whose paths would probably otherwise not cross creates the sense of community so often lacking elsewhere but celebrated in Leek. The view of Leek from The Mount creates a sense of belonging to and connection with the whole town, enhancing this sense of belonging. I may not live the other side of Leek but I can see it every time I walk the Mount and feel part of its whole. The town is visible from The Mount & I can enjoy the view of its special architecture & character. This natural landscape is free for everyone to enjoy and is accessible within minutes of the town centre. It is a landscape and community which would be lost forever should the developments go ahead. Such things are irreplaceable and I despair that The Mount is even being considered as a suitable option. I am a recent newcomer to Leek having moved here three years ago. I have never lived anywhere more welcoming and cheerful and full of people appreciating and making the most of living in such a beautiful place. The Mount is at present a country lane offering peace and tranquil exercise. Its urbanisation would completely change its character and make it a main road connecting Ashbourne & Buxton Roads. The traffic increase would be beyond that contributed to by extra housing as it would become a highly attractive route for those seeking to avoid Leek town centre. The access to and from Ashbourne Road	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO192 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO220 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1352 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						would also radically change the character of that end of town. The increased housing would alter the balance of the town and there is simply not that level of demand for housing in that area. The figures of required housing also appear to be based on doubtful statistics so that the very need for this level of housing in the Moorlands is questionable. It would really be dreadful if this so very important natural landscape were to disappear forever from Leek. In conversation with the people I meet along the Mount, there is a strong feeling of being threatened by changes beyond their control & of losing something very precious. Many people have said they have no faith that their feelings and needs will be valued. Please change their minds and show that local people will be listened to and their objections acted upon. Please don't build on The Mount.	
PO9411	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	• See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9429	Ms Catherine Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!!	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO90 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO678 on ecology evidence
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO90 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO90 on highways • See para response to PO1352 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement • See para response to PO678 about Leek employment land requirements

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE128 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO91	Mr Bill Reid				Object	This area is a most popular area for walkers, runners, drivers and strollers. It has been, for as long as I can remember, an area that provides views over Leek town and the surrounding area which cannot be equalled. It is a beautiful peaceful part of Leek which should not be spoilt by housing estates and the disruption that goes with it. The top of Kniveden Lane has a piece of unadopted road which deters motorists from using it as a thoroughfare and I am sure that this would become adopted if the proposed plans go ahead causing untold traffic, noise and pollution, as well as the dangers to residents from the traffic. There are many areas around Leek which would be far more suitable.	The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's emerging Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral "urban extensions" around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							site LE140 to be of medium landscape sensitivity; recommending that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022 /LE127 /LE128 /LE140 /LE142A /LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development.
PO118	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	Already enough housing in the area. More houses will lead to increased traffic on Mount Road which is very narrow in places. Open spaces and views should be left for public to enjoy when out walking or cycling.	• See para response to PO91 on highways • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence
PO122	B & M Bentley				Object	Urban extension for New Housing is opposed on Mount Road. The relevant issues are 1. Landscape & historic character 2. Health & quality of life 'The Mount' is a known cultural and unique feature for Leek folk and visitors gained over many generations. Offering: Visual beauty, health and community amenity. The many attractions of a 'trip around the mount' would be largely lost. These comments refer to LE127, LE128a and LE140.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about air quality
PO228 PO233	Miss Alicia Guy Mr Daniel Frith				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also. It could bring house prices down as at the moment it is such a lovely peaceful area and this no doubt will change	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 on highways Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO680	Andy McGraw				Object	Extension of the Town Boundary into the Natural Zone The following blocks identified as, potentially suitable housing sites, all appear to be outside the town boundary on the maps supplied by the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, on this second housing consultation June 2016 Block numbers; LE 127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a, LE142b All the above mentioned blocks are therefore proposed to be constructed on the Natural Zone land surrounding the town of Leek. Public Amenity The small narrow lane known as Mount Road which travels between the A53 Leek/ Buxton road and A523 Leek/ Ashbourne road along which the following blocks appear, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a, are used on a daily basis as a public amenity. The lane is constantly used by locals and visitors to walk, ride and enjoy the views in relative safety at present. If the proposed housing goes ahead, with the number of houses planned on these sites, this road will undoubtedly suffer a dramatic increase in the number of vehicles using it, by averaging 2 cars per household, thus reducing its safety and relative quiet enjoyment. The views over the town of Leek and its surrounding countryside will also be affected detrimentally. I also note that the lane is included as part of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks, advertised and mapped by the Ordnance Survey as a recreational path but not highlighted as such on the SMDC consultation map. Surely the increase in vehicular traffic would compromise this route. Other public rights of way, public footpaths, are either not shown or seem now to stop at the new development. When I raised the question of this fact at consultation the officer was unable to answer my query. In these times of austerity and the constant cut backs to local government, areas of free enjoyment and recreational use which also merit health benefits need to be conserved. Wildlife Concerns The blocks shown as, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a are frequently used by several bird species, especially during the winter months, as important feeding grounds. Some of these bird species are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CA81) as Schedule 1 protected species, identified by BirdLife International as Globally Threatened species and are listed as Red List species of birds of conservation concern by organisations, the RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), the British Ornithologists Union, Natural England and the British Trust of Ornithology, to name a few. The birds in question are; Fieldfare Turdus pilaris, Schedule 1 W&CA 81 and Red List species Redwing Turdus iliacus, Schedule 1 W&CA81 and Red List Species Starling Sturnus vulgaris, Red List species The small block of land between blocks LE127 and LE128a is also important to wildlife in particular bird species. Although this land is not earmarked for development I feel that the disturbance of the development would compromise the species using it. This small	Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The consultation map is intended to depict summary information only; it does not for example illustrate public rights of way. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						wooded block is used during the winter months as an important winter roost for a small number of Raven <i>Corvus corax</i>, a species again afforded a certain amount of protection. Species using this block to breed include, Little Owl <i>Athene noctua</i>, although not afforded any specific protection via acts of Parliament or listed as a concern yet, it is a species showing major decline, UK population estimated to be down by 24%, as highlighted by the RSPB breeding bird data 1995 – 2008. Great Spotted Woodpecker <i>Dendrocopos major</i>, Nuthatch <i>Sitta europaea</i>, are other examples of regular breeding species in this area. Due to disturbance I predict that many of these species will refrain from using this important area. Infrastructure As mentioned previously the numbers of new houses proposed in the areas of Mount Road and Thornccliffe Road, blocks LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, will put an enormous strain on the local infrastructure and road system. We all constantly experience the difficulties whilst travelling through the town of Leek caused by any one road closure. Both junctions from Mount Road can be difficult to negotiate now with the small amount of traffic using it with the A523 being particularly dangerous in its present form. Problems with access at both these junctions will be severely increased with the increased volume of traffic. At the original consultation July 2015 there was no mention of increasing employment opportunities even when the question was raised. I still feel that these concerns have yet to be addressed. It was implied but not confirmed that most of the individuals who would be residing in the new development would be commuter based, travelling to nearby cities to seek their employment. This surely is contrary to most local government policies that are tasked with reducing this activity to contribute towards climate change and global warming issues. These planned developments will also have a visual, probably a negative impact from the adjoining Peak District National Park as it will be observed from the iconic Roaches and the boundary road of Morridge. There seems to be little or no mention of the use of brown field sites throughout the proposal. With the relaxation of planning rules for developing these sites should the Council look to these sites first. Removing deteriorating buildings and areas within the	mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. - See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						town that look unsightly and replacing with new developments would surely enhance the town, and, as they are close to amenities within the town centre, reduce the need for occupants to use their motor vehicles on shopping trips or evening entertainment. There are also a number of old mills and factories within the existing town boundary that could and should be transformed and upgraded into apartment blocks, as they have in other towns and cities in the UK, which would save those buildings from further degradation, provide perfect housing within the town and help to keep the overall feel of the town and its history. Conclusion In conclusion it is my belief that the proposed development and size of that development will have a serious and negative impact on the market town of Leek and its Natural Zone boundary. As a society in general we are losing touch with nature and the great outdoors. There are Government initiatives to reverse and combat this trend. Organisations, funded by the National Lottery, Government, County and Local councils including SMDC, are tasked to promote these initiatives assisting people to re-engage with nature. We are also constantly reminded these days of health, well-being and mental health issues that our society is increasingly subject too due to the pressures of our modern living and the need for places for people to unwind. With this in mind how can we justify increasing the urban zone into our countryside. We have a duty to protect iconic landscapes, open spaces and the biodiversity such as can be found within the Mount Road area for the future generations of this fantastic town, so that they too, can experience quiet and peaceful recreation as we have enjoyed over the years. Maybe the Officers involved in making the final decisions should take an early morning walk along the Mount Road to experience these quiet and peaceful surroundings with the only noise being provided by the local bird-life with their dawn chorus. Once we lose these areas they are lost forever.	In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO675	Mr Jonathan Hulme				Object	The mount is an important, free, extensively used recreation facility for Leek. The proximity of the mount to the town makes it easily accessible, providing a rural escape for walkers, cyclists, joggers and families alike. This invaluable resource contributes to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all who use it. The mount provides panoramic views of the town and surrounding moor land including the Roches, and housing developments should not encroach on this. The junctions with the A53 and the A523 are also quite dangerous and unsuited to large amounts of traffic. Some form of traffic management would need to be added to these junctions, increasing congestion in and around the town to even higher levels than currently (which is already too high!!). This deters visitors to the town, reducing the amount of tourist trade. The area is also important ecologically and accommodates a variety of species, some of which appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. This excessive allocation of sites appears to be national policy implemented at a local level without consideration of local needs and demographics. The infrastructure in the east of the town is insufficient to cope with a population influx. For instance, the schools and health facilities are already full. Housing development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in the town such as Davenport mill on Mill Street and the mill on Ashbourne Road. The developers who own these sites should be incentivised to commence development. Redevelop eyesores, don't diminish beauty spots.	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO91 about highways Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. - See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE140 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO701	Mr John Burnett				Object	This existing field forms an intrinsic part of the open space known as the Mount. This field which I believe is still in use by the local high school is also used by many dog walkers as part of their daily routine. Building on this plot of land would mean that use of the Mount Road as an exercise and recreation facility would be severely restricted. I would also object based on my concerns that building in this location would have severe impact on both existing infrastructure including roads and schools and would affect the ground water run off causing issues in other areas of the town. Building on this land would demonstrably damage the aspirations of the local community and would have severe economic and environmental consequences - completely at odds with the objectives of the consultation.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements Council's interim Playing Pitch Strategy 2017 explains that Leek High School lost access to field LE140 during recent lease renegotiation with SCC. LE140 is physically inadequate to accommodate any form of playing pitch. The School identified little requirement for the field. The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that Local Plan Policy will require that, wherever possible, development will promote the reduction of flood risk by the use of sustainable drainage techniques as per the Flood and Water Management Act., as well as taking opportunities to contribute to wider Council objectives such as its emerging Green Infrastructure Network; to enhancing biodiversity and recreation opportunities etc. • See para response to PO680 about economic benefits of housebuilding

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1322	Mr Stapleton	Leek And District Civic Society			Object	I write on behalf of Leek & District Civic Society to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision to include The Mount' Leek as a preferred option for housing development. This area is heavily used by recreational walkers and is the sort of local amenity which would be absolutely spoilt by additional building. Leek has few enough open spaces as it is and the loss of The Mount would be completely unjustifiable. Of all the site options in the Leek area, The Mount is the one which we feel should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected for the present populace and future generations.	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. - See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO1351	Mr A Birks				Object	This morning whilst taking my constitutional stroll around mount road I happened upon a group of people considering the best plots to build houses in this beauty spot. One member of the group introduced herself as a local councillor. My heart sank as it became clear that some minds at least, against the wishes of the local people, the decision to build seems to have been taken. It is outrageous that the local community is once again to be ignored by those elected to serve us. Mount Road is a very important part of the social scene of Leek as local people use it daily to enjoy the countryside which is within their homes. It would be an ecological and social outrage to remove this facility from the people of Leek. This area is more important to the wellbeing of residents from across the town than any other area around Leek as it is their gateway to a relaxed walk in the fresh air in the countryside. Any development of this area would change the nature of Leek as it would necessitate the widening of the road, the installation of lighting and the uprooting of that special commodity trees. The Mount Road would be a major thoroughfare between the Ashbourne Road, and Buxton Road, Kniveden Lane Would be a conduit between the same roads meaning heavy traffic rushing through the estate and there would be a problems caused by necessary construction of major road junctions at each end of the Mount Road. Local residents this would be a disaster. There is a concern too that, with the addition of a large number of houses in this area, the infrastructure at this end of town would be challenged beyond its ability to cope. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very full and recent queues of vehicles to get into town were horrendous during the roadworks in the town. Imagine the chaos should we add another 500 families in the queue. In the unlikely event that Leek should actually need extra accommodation, consideration should be given to brownfields or less intrusive sites first. There are several derelict mills which could be utilised for apartments or demolished for housing. The infrastructure of drains, electricity and gas is readily available	The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. - See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence - See para response to PO91 about highways Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. - See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO675 about educational requirements - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						near these 2 areas too. I appeal to the council to reflect on the wishes of those who elected them to serve their needs and reject the idea of developing this area and retain it for enjoyment and health of the many people of Leek who appreciate it.	See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence
PO1143	Mr R Harrison				Object	I have recently looked at the site plans and talked to one of your officers concerning the location: This is a narrow road, used by many recreational purposes such as walking, cycling. The views over Leek Conservation area and its surrounding area are 2nd to none both night and day. There have been lots of houses built on the east side of Leek in recent years mainly off Ashbourne Road. As the majority of people travel to Macclesfield, Manchester and Stoke on Trent to work, this means they have to travel through the centre and often Leek is gridlocked at busy times. The exits from the Mount onto Buxton and the Ashbourne Roads are both very narrow and difficult to negotiate. Schools at the end of the town are already full to capacity and young children have to be taken across Leek early in the morning and collected in the evening. Dr's Lists are so full. We are told that some of these houses are possible affordable housing. What does this mean? There are plenty of small terrace houses on the market which I would consider as affordable. So do we need more? In fact do we need a 1000 new houses to in Leek at all anywhere? If so I would like to think that there are possible sites in Leek - West End could be given consideration before further action is taken. Leek is a beautiful small town with easy access to countryside. By allowing building on The Mount Road that access will be diminished as more of our green fields turned into housing developments and country roads become clogged with vehicles. Where will it end?	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO91 about highways - See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO91 about 'Options Site Assessments' - See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO675 about educational requirements The Council consults with its Housing Officer when setting definitions of 'affordable' in relation to affordable housing. This usually equates to a percentage of open market value which represents the upper limit that the house can be sold/resold. - See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO938	Mr Chris Clark				Object	Building houses at location LE140 is undesirable, as it would permanently destroy the rural aspect of Mount Road (used on a daily basis by walkers, etc). Whilst the need for a school extension may, at some time, be necessary, this is the wrong location for housing. Kniveden Lane is virtually a no-through-road, as it is currently very rough at the top (Mount Road) end. This makes Kniveden Lane very safe for the children and elderly people who live there. A substantial housing development here would open up Kniveden Lane to through traffic, also creating a "rat-run" for other traffic trying to bypass known bottlenecks.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO1573 PO1578	Mrs S Chauveau Mr PJ Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount. It is a icon beauty spot, Leek's gateway into the open country side and has been popular with walkers, joggers, cyclist and horse riding for generations and should be protected for future generations to I strongly recommend further consideration be given to the developing the empty mills, brownfield Sites and making use of the many vacant homes in the Moorlands before surrendering our precious Greenfields to hungry developers	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1676	Mr Price				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. The grounds for that are:	
PO1682	Mr N A Brundrett						
PO1652	Mrs G Webster					Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1646	Mrs J Lownds					Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1351 about streetlighting
PO1641	Mr W Johnson						
PO1670	Mr S Panek					Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1 st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of leek will become more common. Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking.	• See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way
PO1663	Mr A Panek						
PO1658	Miss J Panek						
PO4769	Mrs A Lomas					High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area. Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments proceed then the 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event. The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	• See para response to PO675 about design policies • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO4753	Miss L Whitehurst						The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1687	Mr David Morgan				Object	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to build houses on the Mount. I specifically object to the building off houses on sites: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. When I first heard about the proposal to build in this area. I was genuinely shocked and still cannot believe that the proposal have been submitted to build on such beautiful landscape which has helped to shape Leek's identity as Queen Of the moorlands. I work in the local community and I have not heard a single resident of Leek express support for these proposals – they have expressed deep anger and concern. I live locally to the Mount and regularly take walks there and it is very clearly, a popular destination for walkers and cyclist. However, I do not feel that this is area that is solely of Leek by these who live in its vicinity. I believe that the mount is an area that the people of Leek genuinely cherish and it would be a tragedy if a major housing development were built along it, The Mount does provide an important amenity for local residents including Hargate estate. I feel it would be unacceptable to build houses on it, spoiling the unspoilt beauty of the area and leading to a huge increase in the traffic which would obviously cause a major hazard to walkers and cyclist. I feel it is unacceptable to deprive residents of a very built up area such as Haregate estate of the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful country side and open space this that the mount offers. If this proposal is passed then I feel that the character and identity of Leek will be very adversely affected and this will have a very detrimental impact on its image in terms of visitors and attracting business	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO675 on design policies
PO1603	Mr T A Taylor				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1282	Mrs B Ward				Object	I write once again to protest against the proposed development of housing along and off mount road. We have already had 2 public enquires and each time the inspector has upheld the decision not to allow these fields to develop along mount road. This is a great amenity for the town, especially for residents this side of leek. I feel that we have been left a short stretch off mount road but with all the roads going off it Mount Road itself will probably have to be widened and will become a bi pass for traffic between Buxton Road. Walking along a country lane enjoying the views. Do people walk as much on the other side of town? Aren't there still places for the development within the town? Not touching our open spaces. Where are 600 new houses on Mount Road going to work?	The Council must justify proposed land allocations which form part of its new Local Plan to planning inspector during public examination of the Local Plan. The Inspector must consider the 'soundness' of the Plan as per para 182 NPPF. Note that as part of this process the Council must demonstrate that it meets its objectively assessed development requirements for housing (and other land uses) for the District. • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1403	Mrs M Smith				Object	With regard to the proposed 400 plus houses to be built on the mount, I would like to express my concerns on the matter. I can't help but for see the problems 400 to 800 cars will create, trying to leave Mount Road to gain access to the Buxton Road. They will be queuing up! Most families these days have at least one car some have two. Mount Road was not built for such traffic	• See para response to PO91 about highways
PO1485	Mrs C Lane				Object	I object to any housing being built in this area. It is an area used by many people for walking etc. – many for health reasons e.g. for me. We must keep our open spaces that are in walking distance of our town, once lost – gone forever. Don't let us loose it	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1528	Mr E Weston				Object	I totally object the development of green belt land in Leek and the surrounding areas this includes the mount and elsewhere but morally wrong. It is just wrong to build on the green belt land the town can't cope now, never mind the extra traffic this would create. What are the planners thinking of even including these areas? If all councillors and planners have regard for the environment in question, they would not be included. What difference is there between Pickwood, The Mount and other green belt sites? You threw the recent planning applications out for Pickwood, what's the difference? Surely there are enough brownfield sites in Leek and the surrounding areas, plus existing housing stock for the needs of Leek, now and the future? Leek is a small market town not a extension of the city, (well not at the moment). Who decided we need all these extra houses? Am I right in saying the SMDC will be getting a hefty amount of cash for each dwelling built, from central government? As I have said before you the planners and councillors should get together and try your utmost to encourage more business and industry to come to Leek, offering them incentives of some sort. The people of Leek need work and industry to come to Leek, offering incentives of some sort. The people of Leek need work, full not partime) and not more houses. Leek is fast becoming a dormitory town.	• See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Planning applications are assessed against the current Development Plan including the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy Policies. • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1712	Mr G Carding				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on Mount Road leek. The Mount has been a historic to the people of leek for generations for its 360 degree panoramic views of natural beauty. Being born in Leek I have walked over the mount all my life and always enjoyed the peace and quiet surrounded by the countryside views which are irreplaceable building housing in this area would also destroy the wildlife and a result in the loss of open space. This road is unsuitable for the large volume of traffic which would be generated by all the new houses and is narrow in places with dangerous junctions at both end of the road. The roads in this part cannot take any more traffic. Please find more suitable site within the town, if we keep building out into the countryside where will the border of Leek End? Ashbourne	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO1699	Mr Michael Owen				Object	My wife and I would like to tender our personal objections to any proposed house building along Mount Road Leek. We don't feel that the area has infrastructure to cope with the number of houses proposed and would spoil the landscape of a very popular and picturesque area used extensively by Leek residents	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements
PO1744	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	LE142b, le142a, le140, Le128a, Le022, Le127 I write to object to the proposal to all the building of housed along mount road as set	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						out in the preferred options doc. My 2 main objections are based on the implications for the environment and the traffic. Environment – For generations Mount Road has been a favourite walking/cycling/horse riding route for many residents of Leek. It is easily accessible (not requiring a car to reach it) and is quiet safe place by way which can be used by all people of all ages in all weathers. The major attraction is walkers are the outstanding vista the road provides both town and county. The proposed building at the north would destroy the turn the road into a noisy, busy thoroughfare, that would be unsafe and unpleasant for walkers and all over leisure users. The proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean the views of the town would be lost, whilst the proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean views of the town would be lost. At a time when all our members of society are being encouraged to take more exercise the destruction of the mount is free, natural gym, seems very short sighted. Immediate area Mount road is not a wide enough area to safely take a major increase in traffic. The existing access points to this area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are wholly inadequate and dangerous for the high volume of vehicles. If as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road causes minimal amount of problems. An increase in traffic will queues will lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Where will they go to do these activities? Traffic The consequences of the traffic of building many houses both in the immediate area and the town as whole will be very marked. Work Very few work in Buxton or Ashbourne which re easily accessible from the mount. The vast majority work in the town centre, the barn field's industrial estate or on Cheadle road. Those commuting out of the town centre will be heading mostly to stoke Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that the major building works to the east of leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging site LE142b and LE140. Is there not a possibility of the building on the site existing site of Kniveden Hall (which is screened of by trees) and the old Social Services building? These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and still generate a lot more traffic throughout the town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway in a linear park (the high lane). Would that Leek had planners and leader of similar vision to develop mount road into a high lane for the benefit all off the community	access • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 on design policies • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1351 about tree protection • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142B is of high landscape sensitivity and development could be visible from the peak Park, and the rural approach to Leek; - LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended; - LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1751	Mr and Mrs W Lovatt				Object	LE069, LE143a, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. We would like to submit our comments concerning the above consultations with the specific regard to leek east. These consultations with specific regard to leek Ease and the area of mount road. This is a semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of the attractions of this area of leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10minutes walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking jogging and cycling. This is a important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to a nature very close to the heart of leek. The views from the mount are spectacular and largely unspoilt. Any developments of any of all the listed developments of the type proposed would totally alter the area, as it has with the Buxton Road end of Mount road. If all the development listed above were to proceed. In excess 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development especially on the bad junction where mount road meets Ashbourne road near Poplar Service Station.. Access via the already existing estate off kniveden lane and or High View road and Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature off the roads in question and the cars parked on either side of the roads in what is a already busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious consequences Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land that would be ideal for development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development would be ideal of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities and would be more sustainable as they would result from a increase in traffic in outlying areas. Given to the employment situation in Leek, a large proportion of these would inevitably be homes for communities for the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would ruin the character and community feel of the area. Given the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable housing in rural locations, more consideration should be given this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this town.	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include sites LE069/LE143A. - See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO91 about highways Leek is already served by a number of frequent or less frequent bus routes, connecting to centres such as Hanley, Cheadle, Buxton and Macclesfield. A number of these use main arterial routes such as Buxton Road/Ashbourne/Springfield Road. In some circumstances, major residential developments may be required to contribute to improved bus routes/bus facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Pol T1/Staffordshire Local Transport Plan. - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence - See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO675 about design policies An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing.
PO1758	Mrs J Lovatt						
PO1773	Mr S Lovatt						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1472	Mrs G Armstrong				Object	As a resident of Moorland Road since 1975, I write to you to express my concerns over the appalling plan to yet again to destroy an area of the town much loved and frequented by its residents for countless generations. I can assure you that the contents of the letter not only reflect the views of me and the residents of Moorland Road and Kniveden Lane but those of Leek in general. The proposal to build 400 houses on the Mount came as a shock to the town. Whilst I am not opposed to the idea of providing some housing in the Leek area, I cannot equate with the requirement for the number your department are planning. As regards the location, how can you say that a beautiful location like the Mount is in need of development when there are numerous locations that in the area that are an eyesore and would be more than fit the bill for re-development? If your department were to take the time to canvass the people of Leek you would find that it is considered an asset to this town. The Mount is an area of outstanding rural beauty with great views across the town, supporting an abundance of wildlife whose habitat would be destroyed if the plan goes ahead. It has long been a source of relaxation, leisure, exercise, and even welcomes retreats for courting couples and families with children or people exercising their pets can be seen walking the Mount in complete safety without the fear of being subjected to danger from large numbers of cars. This would change if the whole scheme goes ahead. Is it right that future generations should be denied the pleasure their forebears derived from this beautiful road, With an average of each household owning 2 cars each the plan to build 400 residents could unleash about 800 vehicles all trying to support those numbers. Mount Road would be saturated with vehicles all trying to leave either via the junction with the A523 Ashbourne Road or the A53 Buxton Road. Both roads are very busy main roads. After frustration of accessing these knock on effect would choke the town centre which struggles now at certain times to maintain a smooth flow. No doubt the unadapted and unmade section of Kniveden Lane would be upgraded encouraging it to be used as a short cut between Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road. The only thing that stops it being a rat track now is that it is unmade and has ruts and pot holes. Also of concern is that with this sort of development you require to provide a proportion for social housing. We all know who are housed in these and what effect it has on the surrounding area. I need say no more. Can you explain why there seems determination within the planning bodies to destroy what is beautiful and precious to the people of Leek with total disregard to the preservation of the environment and wishes of the Leek populace. If they want to improve this town why don't they concentrate on some of those areas in dire need of redevelopment and of which there are many in this town. I along with the majority of the other house owners in the vicinity, share at the lack of the thought that has obviously not been thought that has gone into this project. I ask the question; have any of the councillors or those on the planning department actually	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing • See para response to PO1351 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						bothered to walk to location, to see for themselves what they would be destroying and ask residents for their thoughts. No, I doubt it very much if this is the case. Is it just a figure on the map to them? I understand that the majority are not from Leek and so don't really have its best interests at heart. These so-called councillors were voted in to represent the townsfolk and listen to their view. This has not obviously been thought out thoroughly and it makes me wonder what sort of people will be running the council. Is it yet again something to their advantage and not that of the town. Their priorities do not appear to be the people of Leek there to represent them. I make this representation not only on behalf of those directly affected but also the people of Leek who are totally opposed to this desecration of one of the most beautiful and well-loved areas.	
PO1523	Ms Angie Guest				Object	Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of Leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO1560	Miss A Hampson				Object	Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on Leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in Leek	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO1570	Miss L Sheldon				Object	I wish to object the proposed development on Mount Road for the following reasons: Serious damage to the natural habitat of endangered wildlife changing the entire environment forever. Increase traffic would cause major traffic issues not only cause major issues on the Mount itself but having a knock on effect on the town where congestion is already an issue. For generations the Mount has been a popular venue for walkers' biker's families in general. It has provided a safe and pleasant environment and giving access to some of the finest views across Leek and Staffordshire Moorlands.	• See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1555	Mrs G Webster				Object	I have never protested before but I feel compelled to write this letter regarding the proposed developments across the moor. When I was young I lived on Haregate Est and many times my parents took my siblings and I across the moor it was something we enjoyed seeing all the farm animal and wildlife. As I got older I would still walk the moor and dream of one day owning one of the houses which were only a couple of minutes' walk away from being in the countryside. That dream was realised in 1976. Now I am retired it is wonderful to be able to stroll round the moor each day. My husband twice a day come rain or shine, and able to do just that take in the views or have conversations with people we meet, not just from this area but from other parts of town. It is good for the soul as well as the mind. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is precious and should be protected for future generations 'never know what you have got till it's gone' comes to mind as was the case with what was a beautiful roundabout which stood proud at the top off Derby St. Do we need so many more houses in Leek if so we do not build on the field opposite the cricket club on Macclesfield Road which would not have the catastrophic impact of hundreds of houses on the moor or why not build them on Blackshaw Moor where there is already a small estate. I hope this marvellous asset treasured by so many can be saved for the town and the people of Leek.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt Blackshaw Moor is identified as a 'smaller village' in the Council's emerging Local Plan and should only attract a limited amount of additional housing within or around the built up area. Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.
PO1550	Mr P Sinclair				Object	Would like to object to the development of the 350+ homes on sites across the Moor. The area is used by lots of people walkers, families with young and older children dog walkers, cyclist, runners, horse riders, all enjoying the wonderful views over the Leek, which has been enjoyed for many years. I've been coming around the moor since I moved to Leek in the late 60's, building more houses will mean the loss of this lovely scenery for ever. Also the health & safety factors of all these extra cars 600-700 trying to get out at either end of the moor, onto the Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road which is already busy without adding additional traffic. Then pollution of the air	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1536	Mrs C Whitehurst				Object	I am disappointed that local objections to development along Mount Road Leek have been ignored by those who claim to represent us, and I must once again voice my objections. The Mount is one of our most beautiful and well-loved amenities for local walkers, cyclist, runners and dog walkers. A short walk from town which I personally use at least 3 times a week whenever I walk around I meet at least 10-12 others. It is also a safe route to take children of all ages to appreciate the country side, farm use and wonderful views – all of which will disappear. Many habitats for small animals and birds will go along the grass verges and lost trees, so much for our greener landscapes. Who is going to buy these obviously very expensive houses not my children who can hardly afford to rent never mind buy? But I'm sure the overspill from Macclesfield, Manchester + Buxton will appreciate these cheaper houses than they can afford there. Where will all the children go to school our local ones are full and have little or no space to expand, more Drs and Dentists will be needed. Traffic along the Mount will be busy. It has already increased during times of the road closures repairs etc, and now this new short cut has been found it will continue to be used. As there are now plans in place to convert several old apartments such as Old Mills in the town a large number of houses will not be needed by local people and smaller brown field sites can be found in and around Leek for a much more acceptable amount rather than such a large estate. If the £1000 per house built is so tempting why not just ask us for more council tax – I'm sure most people would be willing to pay to save this precious area for our children and grandchildren. I would. Please please listen to our objections regarding this atrocity in our wonderful town.	• See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1351 about tree protection • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus
PO1532	Mr B Day				Object	The Mount is a very important area for the town of Leek. This whole area is an important amenity area for the town – it was promised a few years ago that there will be no further development after the completion of Mountside gardens. Further developments will destroy the open views of the Morridge from the town. Some of the areas highlighted for development was gifted to the town presumably to protect them and for agricultural use. Development of the Mount will lead to greatly increased traffic on what is basically a country lane. Safety issues at both junctions. The importance of the local people who use it. Young walkers, runners, joggers, cyclist, horse riding, dog walkers. These include singles, couple. Family groups and organised walking groups aside. We urge you to look at these plans very carefully before you decide to ruin this beautiful area. Surely there are other smaller areas which could be utilized for future needs.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1490	Ms Dawn Garrett				Object	I write with reference to the planning proposals along The Mount in Leek. I moved to Leek last August, the countryside being one of the big draws. I'm dismayed to find that my favourite dog walk is earmarked for extensive development. The absolutely magnificent views would be lost forever. The birdsong drowned out by the inevitable increased traffic load. The wildflowers at the side of the road and the sheep peacefully grazing, all gone. The creeping urbanisation of such a lovely country town is a big worry. Surely it would be better environmental sense to deal with the falling-down mills and derelict housing in the town before building any further? Regeneration is a much more modern concept and would further revitalise the town itself. For me and my family access to the views, the fresh air and the wildlife is balm against our stressful and hectic working lives. I live on Ashbourne Road so this is not NIMBYism at work, it is a genuine plea to save this lovely area for everyone. Now and in the future.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1583	Mr C Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I love to go running there with my dad and really enjoy the view into open countryside.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence
PO1588	Mr J Jones				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1708	Mr C Hoggarth				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A I am writing to you with regards to you with my objection to the proposed sites above for housing development that I consider will result in loss of countryside and a recreational amenity to local residents. My objections consist of 3 main concerns: The loss of green field sites. The enclosure of the open space that is Mount Road. The loss of recreational amenity of Mount Road through the amount of additional traffic. The areas of land in question is border Mount Road, a low traffic route with broad open views across countryside to the east over the town of Leek and beyond to its west. Mount Road well known locally for the pleasurable route for exercise it provides and is much used by local residents and visitors. Enclosure with housing development would turn an open country lane into just another urban roadway and would destroy the views reducing the attraction of the area. The associated increase in the traffic would severely reduce the safety route. I consider that the cumulative effect would be to destroy the area as a recreational amenity. Of the area surrounding the current town boundaries, I think that this is one that would constitute the greatest loss, both with respect to the beauty of the outlook and the loss of its use for recreation. Mount Road is a beautiful location; visitors jealously comment how lucky I am to have such an area on my doorstep. To destroy it would be a disgrace and I hope you will reconsider the proposals	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way
PO1717	Miss JM Botham				Object	With reference to the proposal for the Mount new housing development This is and has been a delightful walk for the people of Leek for many years. The older generation will have fond and lasting memories of the courtships over the Mount. We as children used it for walking and horse riding in safety to go further afield to Cheddleton Heath. We know in recent times it is and it is a popular route of the Staffordshire Moorlands walk. We believe more ought to be done with the Brown Fields site this would clear unsightly buildings and in most cases be more convenient to the town allowing for less use of vehicles and allowing for less use of vehicles and allowing for the green areas to be maintained for leisure pursuits.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1694	Ms K Machin				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on the mount road, leek as outlined in the preferred options site and boundaries of staffs moorlands local plans – sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. This area should not be built on as it will ruin the lovely views over Leek and the Horizon and has been enjoyed for generations by walker's cyclist etc, who on a nice day vastly outnumber cars on this stretch of road. This road also appears to be outside the site boundary. By building approx. 400 houses it will no longer be a country walk yet another housing est. The council should be committed to maintaining green belt land and encouraging people to get fresh air and exercise in an age increasing obesity. There are surely plenty of empty mills and brownfield or former industrial sites within the town which could be developed for housing instead of building on open fields. There is also no development proposed in the west end of leek-why not? The planners need to go back to their drawing board and identify more suitable sites across the whole leek instead of concentrating on the one unsuitable area. Please save the mount	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1703	Mrs J McGuinness				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A. As a local resident in objection to the above proposed plans For the Mount in Leek. I object to the scale of development for this beautiful country lane on the outskirts of our town. It is a area of outstanding beauty, boasting much wildlife, flora and fauna. The woodland and hedgerows are home to valued wildlife and birds. In addition there are farm animals, bats, foxes, stoats, mice all of which inhabit this area has been identified over existing brownfield sites in town. Could the planners not relax the rules and allow sites in town that have been previously been refused for development? Do we really need 400 houses? Do we really need another 1 st school, at this end of the town? I am dubious as there are as many properties in the town already for sale, unoccupied or derelict. Where are all the people coming from to buy these 400 houses? My main objection is the sheer volume of traffic. The roads are totally unsuitable to accommodate the amount of traffic that's will be generated by a school and 400 houses. This development has the potential to create at least 800 cars from the proposed housing development (average 2 cars per house hold) and even more generated from schools with staff and pupils, including the cars school buses . The lane is already suffers from many vehicles using the lane, as a rat run and this will increase. In addition to being a resident The Mount I am also a daily dog walker and I am concerned for the safety of those using the lane for leisure, i.e walker, dog walkers, joggers, mums with little ones, cyclists, horse riders and those coming to sit on the seats provided to take in the beautiful views. If development goes ahead these activities will come to an end and once again our green landscape will disappear with the town boundaries being pushed out further and further. Where will local people be able to go without getting into these cars and causing more traffic	It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						congestion on the roads, and what about those without transport? The road junction at either end of the Mount are not without difficulties. The Buxton Road junctions is a staggered cross roads with Novi Lane and needs to be approached with caution. At school times it is used by parents/carers/school buses. I cannot imagine the chaos that will transpire if another school is permitted on the Mount – it will certainly become a lot busier and more dangerous. Do we really want to put our children at risk? Walking to and from school will not be a solution as it will be to dangerous. Let us not forget that in additions to this road junction, a short distance down the same road Churnet View transport comes onto the Buxton Road via Abbotts Road, and Leek High/The Meadows/East St 1 st School all feed into and use Buxton Road via Springfield Road. Each school has buses/taxis and cars transporting pupils and the volume using the roads at the same time of day has potential to cause bottle necks on this busy main road. Another school shall mean 7 school all using the same road – local residents will have to keep of the road to the volume of traffic down. The other end of the mount leads to Ashbourne road and this junction not only has obscured visual access but a difficult angled junction. Surely this is totally unsuitable to transport large volumes of traffic which will be generated from 400 houses and a school! If a alternative junction is proposed this can only be achieved by sacrificing another green field. The Mount, Ashbourne Road are all used by big lorries, buses, tractors, trailers, farm stock to and from stock market, farm machinery, lorries transporting goods to and from Buxton, Ashbourne, and Surrounding areas. These are very busy roads! Can we really add to this without causing major problems? I urge the council to consider these proposals very carefully giving due time and consideration to alternative sites in town, because once the boxes are ticked it will be irreversible and the mount will be changed forever.	
PO2584	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2908	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	The allocations proposed around Mount Road will necessitate highway improvements for example road widening, provision of footways, completing Kniveden Lane to adoptable standard, possible (probable) junction improvements at one or both ends. The removal of the sites between LE127 and LE128a could make the delivery of the required scheme more complicated and therefore requires further consideration including the reinstatement of sites LE069 & LE128b.	Comments noted. See para response to PO91 about highways. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount are not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO3656	Mr P Ash				Object	My husband and I most strongly oppose the number of sites on Mount Road, Leek as preferred option for new homes. Both of us have lived in Leek all our lives and for the past 50 years have resided on the Moorland Road. Mount Road is acknowledged as an area of open space for walking, cycling, and jogging and it is a area of free from volumes of traffic? I know my mother exercised, pushing me in my pram walking round the Mount. Building houses either side of the road would most likely make the Mount Road into a main road linking Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road. This road is not sustainable not wide enough to take heavy vehicles and constant stream of Traffic, if numerous houses were to be built either side for Health and Safety reason would require pavements, gutters and drainage all of which will narrow, the width of the road for vehicles, in all probability each house will have 2 cars, which again will increase the flow of traffic. To surface the top of Kniveden lane would make this road a rat race and a highway leading to an increase of even more traffic may I remind the council that when the developers applied for planning permission to build homes on the land behind sunny view at the end of Ashbourne Road – grave concern was exposed by Staffordshire County Council of traffic from the houses converging onto a busy main road, would that not also apply to traffic from the houses converging onto 2 main roads – Ashbourne road,, and at the other end of Buxton road. I would like to draw your attention to the fact when Mr William Milnes gave the land he owned to the council, land where now stands Leek High School, and is playing fields which borders Kniveden Lane and extend on the Mount, there was a clause in the gift of land that this land would be only used for educational purposes. One may also ask the council "where are all families and buyers that require these houses? Leek has not the facilities to accommodate such a huge increase in its population. The Dr's	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways The Council is not aware of any legal encumbrances upon this site. • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						are already working to their full capacity, which schools primary and senior have places for an increase in children of school age? And where will the new comers to the area, travelling from the Mount to Macclesfield or to the potteries will increase the flow of traffic though the centre of the town these were problems with planning permission to build house on ?? At Leek brook on the site of Joshua Wardens factory, as to the nature of the ground and the fact the earth may have become contaminated from factory work etc. These problems were overcome and rectified and houses were built. Now houses cannot build on this land surrounding Sainsbury's Supermarket because of problems with the land – if land at Leekbrook can overcome the problems with the land around Sainsbury's overcome the problem? And houses can be built on land previously occupied and accommodating buildings.	See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO3694	Mrs C Ryan				Object	I am writing to express my objection to recently published plans to build on a large area of the Mount in Leek. Whilst understanding there is a need for some new housing, I feel this area is the wrong place and definitely too extensive. A few points I would like to share which may not take into account the professional opinion but a certainly take a common sense view. The Sainsbury's site was passed as a area for retail and business development with a to build on a small housing estate. This has not been fully developed and I understand it may because there are issues with asbestos and or some other contamination. Yet it seems it is fit for a pub selling food, a children's party play area and a supermarket selling some other consumable goods. If it is the case that there have been some bad decisions made around this site, the council officers responsible for passing this plan should own up and ensure this site is cleaned up. Enabling the plans many locals objected to, be completed. Of course this will mean a cost to the taxpayers whom are left carrying the financial burden of bad decisions made. I have no objection Education Land boarding Mount Road being to extend or build a primary school as have a shortage of places, the concern would be of increased traffic and the requirement for good provision of off road parking at the school if there were to be an entrance on that road. There is a site on the Buxton road Blackshaw Moor which has stood unused for many years since the Army ceased training there. It must have drainage, electrics and water on this site. This would be ideal for a small scale affordable housing site. It would also benefit the local school which has a small numbers of pupils and probably in danger of being closed in years to come Transport should not be a issue because there some buses to Buxton and local bus companies can benefit by providing peak time services. There must be other sites within Leek area suitable for developing. I tried to locate brownfield site on SMDC website but it shows many wordy documents but nothing is clearly stating where these sites lie. This could be my ineptitude but there could be more clarity for the lay person on these issues Building in such a large scale on The Mount would devalue housing already there.	- See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO3656 about Sainsburys consent - See para response to PO675 about educational requirements - See para response to PO91 about highways - See para response to PO1555 about Anzio Camp - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - Property values are not considered material in planning law. - See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing - See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						This may be viewed as a narrow minded but many people have worked hard and taken out huge loans to secure their desired homes. To effect there in such a drastic way I think is unfair and unnecessary. Most of the housing is currently at the higher end of the market and build social or low cost housing amongst this could be problematic from all prospective. If housing is built at the current level at these sites then who shall benefit those on low paid jobs, where I understand the most need is there are many units built as affordable part share homes unsold and many more privately owned sites of apartments etc. standing empty in Leek.	
PO3642	Mr and Mrs Jones				Object	We would like to formally submit our comment concerning the above consultation with specific regard to Leek East LE127, LE069, LE128, LE066, LE142a and LE142b. These consultations relate to Leek East and the area of Mount Road. This semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of its attractions of this area of Leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10 minutes' walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the Mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking, jogging and cycling. This is important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this, together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to nature very close to the heart of Leek. The combination of these two aspects make an early morning walk or late evening jog across Mount a uplifting and almost spiritual experience. The views from the Mount over Leek are spectacular and are largely unspoilt. Any development of the type and proposed would totally alter the character of the area, as it has with Buxton road end of the Mount. If all of the developments listed above were to proceed in excess of 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount Road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development, especially on the bad junction where Mount Road meets Ashbourne Road, given the development has taken place from an old development that has already taken place on an old Quarry site and the proposed development on the other side of Ashbourne Road, near to the Poplar Service station, access via the already existing estate off either Kniveden Lane and or High View Road and or Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature of roads in question are busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious safety consequences. Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land which would be ideal for the development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities, and would be more sustainable as they would not involve significant damage to the environment that would result from an increase of traffic outlying	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO675 on design policies • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1751 about bus routes • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO675 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing It is standard practice for residential schemes which generate a requirement for 'local needs' affordable housing to have future occupation of those dwellings controlled via legal agreement linked to conditions upon the planning consent. Planning applications are assessed against the current Development Plan including the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy Policies. Note site LE069 is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						areas. Given the department from Leek of major employers such as the Britannia Building Society, a large proportion of these houses would inevitably be home for commuters from the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would totally ruin the character and community feeling of the area, and further issues in relation to the sustainable investment in local infrastructure. Planning conditions stating that the occupiers should have a connection with the local area have repeatedly been shown to be unenforceable in the contexts of the urban development. There have been applications for planning permission relating to these areas before, most notably, in 2007. This was refused on appeal, given the strength of feeling within the local community against this development. Any temptation to alter the town development boundary to facilitate these proposals should be resisted as there is no proven case that the type or amount of development proposed is justifiable. Given in the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable houses in rural locations, more consideration should be given to this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of the town.	
PO4725	Mr D And L Robinson				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a Central Government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself is the site allocated off Mount Road, Leek. At present most of the estates west of Mount Road are below the crest of the Mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of High View Road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along High View Road and Moorland Road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the Town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the Southern and Western flank of Leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the Mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	• See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1351 about streetlighting • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO91 about highways Note that vehicular access to LE127 is anticipated off Mount Road; SCC Highways response was predicated on this (not High View Road). The Council would assess residential schemes in proximity to approved wind turbines in accordance with Core Strategy and NPPF amenity Policies, and ETSU (as amended) noise criteria etc. • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO675
PO4730	Miss CM Hambleton						
	Mr RP kerr						
PO4721	Mr M Turnock						
PO4734	Mr W Trafford						
PO4740							

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response in PO701 about utilities and flood risk
PO4697	Mr And Mrs C and P Deighton				Object	We are writing to register our very deep concern about the proposal to build on the land at the Mount in Leek. Those involved in the making such decisions do not all live in Leek and probably unaware of the enormous importance of The Mount to the people living around it in Leek. The implications of losing this much loved countryside walk are very serious, and far reaching. The close proximity of The Mount to the homes of so many local people means that it is a place used regularly, often daily, for exercise and relaxation, and is vital to their health and mental well-being. A large number of local residents are elderly, and often unable to drive: there are young families who cannot afford a car: there are several care homes that residents come for walks with their careers. What make The Mount so important is that is so very close to people. It offers beautiful views across the fields and means that people, who cannot get out into the countryside further away, can still enjoy seeing the birds and animals here only just a small walk from where they live. People walking their dogs have a natural means of contact and conversation with others – so important especially for those who live alone. To sum up, we all be deeply distressed to lose this place. So many have been walking there all through their lives, the disruption, and seeing the gradual destruction of a cherished part of their lives will bring an increased sense of isolation, and the feeling of depression faced by those in their later years as they become less able to things without outside help. Having the ability to step outside and walk in open surroundings without having to ask for a lift means a lot to someone struggling to retain their independence and enjoyment for life. To build on The Mount is clearly not necessary. There are as we have all been made aware recently, many alterations for example: various Brown Field sites empty buildings such as factories and offices: disused mills, empty houses apparently unoccupied for long periods. In view of the very unpopular bad decisions made, and the continuing loss of trust in the judgement made and continuing loss of and motives, of the planning department many now suspect that the decisions are influenced mainly by financial incentives from Government or other sources. We do not know whether this is true, but it seems obvious to us that a prompt decision to abandon the idea of building The Mount would bring peace of mind to many Leek Residents and go a long way to restoring the public's belief that members of the Planning Department actually do care about, and will respond to, consider and respect the views, the well-being and even the happiness, of the town they responsible for looking after, both now and the future.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3936	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG			Object	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1] which states: The proposed urban extension to the east of the town...- LE127(100), LE128a(47), LE140(63), LE142a(140) and LE142b(40). The proposed extension also accommodates draft reserve sites LE069(42), LE128b(48) and LE066(50). These sites contribute a significant proportion of the proposed housing for Leek. The allocation of these sites, ahead of available brownfield/previously developed sites, is not in compliance Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy, which sets out the overarching strategy for development in Leek. ...None of the proposed allocations are considered likely to come forward in the short term based on the findings set out in the SHLAA (2015). However, we suggest that the allocation of sites which are deliverable within the short term should have been considered to a greater extent in formulating the preferred options due to the significant shortfall of housing delivery across the district. WYG consider that sites in Leek, such as LE243, are suitable to contribute to the short term delivery of housing in Staffordshire Moorlands. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the draft potential allocations weighs heavily on this eastern stretch of agricultural land and it is noted that no potential allocations have been selected within the core urban area.	Refer to Council response to PO3934 under LE127 table Question 10 Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO4827	Mrs L Scragg				Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4706	Mr and Mrs A & N Waterhouse				Object	Building 400+ houses on the area known by everyone as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gate way to the countryside would be against everything that "localism" would bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and it's unrivalled and area as a whole acts as a buffer, between the town and the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra houses would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and junctions at either end of The Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work, use the Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield Road with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek Town Centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for houses thereby saving this precious area for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements
PO5883	Ms Linda M Beighton				Object	While objecting to major development destroying the amenity of Mount Road. I would like to support site LE140 as potential housing site. I would also like to suggest that the land on the Macclesfield Road be considered – between High Up Lane and the cricket ground entrance. While this lovely entrance to Leek it would appear to be more appropriate to have people housed here nearer places of likely employment and avoiding daily congestion of traveling through the town from sites on the east.	Support for inclusion of LE140 noted. • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements
PO9101	Ms S Naisbett				Object	I am writing to strongly object to the councils draft plan to build on the following area along Mount Road in Leek, Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 There are many other brown field sites in Leek such as Foker Grange and Home Farm that are available for development, and where houses could be built. Surely these sites should be used first for any planned housing development. The area along Mount Road should remain as it is. Beautiful open green fields. There should be no need to build further homes in the green belt of Leek when there are approximately 1,170 homes that are currently empty in the Staffordshire Moorlands, and an additional 2500 homes for sale. Leek is a Market Town, and this is its great appeal to the people who live here, and also to those who travel to the town to shop, as well as tourists who come to visit. If the town keeps growing due to more and more houses being built, it will no longer be an attractive historic market town, it will become a very large town centered around housing, and if the building continues year on year it will eventually result in Leek becoming a modern day city. Mount Road is a wonderful area of natural beauty that is also very educational for young children. My daughter and I often walk along Mount Road because she likes to be surrounded by the green open fields and	• See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 on design policies • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about air quality • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1751

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the nature it holds. She loves seeing and learning about the different types of wild flowers, butterflies, wildlife and farm animals we see in the fields along Mount Road. If houses were built on Reference number LE127a; LE128a; LE140 there would be nowhere locally for children who live in the area to experience this kind of nature and wildlife. Mount Road is also an extremely popular place for walkers, joggers, and cyclists, because it is currently a very quiet area, (has low noise pollution), and also has few vehicles currently passing through it, hence is an area with low levels of air pollution. The green open spaces make it a very relaxing area, with wonderful views. If 380 houses were to be built in the area, it is estimated that over 750 more cars will be travelling along Mount Road on a daily basis, causing high levels of noise pollution and high levels of air pollution to the area. Thus making it a noisy, unhealthy, stressful area to walk, jog etc. This could lead to less people in the area going for walks etc/carrying out physical exercise. This goes against government efforts encourage people to be active and get fitter in order to fight against illness and obesity, e.g fit for life, and yet the Council is planning to build on a green field area which is ridiculous. Wildlife will be lost if houses are built on Mount road. My friends and I have seen wide variety of wild animals in the fields along Mount Road including wild rabbits, hedgehogs, badgers and buzzards. These areas of wildlife would be lost if houses were built here. The roads in the town are extremely busy with traffic. This makes them unsafe for young children to ride their bikes and scooters along. Mount Road is located on the very edge of town, and due to the current low traffic levels of traffic, this makes it an ideal area for children to safely ride their scooters and bikes. If 380 houses were built along Mount Road the road would become extremely busy with traffic making it another road which is not safe for young children to ride their bicycles. Question why don't disused buildings in Leek such as old mills be converted to affordable housing for young people, instead of allowing of 3, 4 or five bedroom luxury homes to be built along Mount Road- which is what developers will build along areas LE127a; LE128a; LE140. An example of this are the houses built relatively recently by Amos Group on land adjacent to Mount Road which were priced at over £230,000 each. All of the above reasons clearly show why the area along Mount Road Reference number should not be built on.	about affordable housing See para response to PO91 about heritage impact considerations The Council maintains a database of housing site suggestions (SHLAA). This database formed the basis of the 2015 'Site Options' consultation as all SHLAA sites above a minimum size threshold, and attracting a 'B' deliverability rating, were included in that consultation. Subsequently 2016 'Preferred Options' were narrowed down from this. Note that Home Farm LE138 attracted a 'C' deliverability rating. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO9145	Mr Ramon West				Object	We wish to object to the 4 preferred housing allocation sites on the Mount, Leek. It would be an outrage to proceed with residential development on any of these sites: LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a. The Council must take into consideration: Loss of local amenity - the Mount is a popular amenity enjoyed and cherished by walkers, joggers, cyclists, nature-lovers and dog-walkers. There is no comparable open countryside leisure amenity so close to the town centre. There is no comparable alternative within easy walking distance on the east side of town. Loss of such amenity would have an adverse effect on the health	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO675 on

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						and wellbeing of a great many local people. Visual impact - the Mount is a classic example of outstanding moorland scenery. It provides unique and wonderful views over the town and beyond. Leek prides itself, and markets itself, as the Queen of the Moorlands. If this is to mean anything, the Council must do everything it can to halt the expansion of the town into the surrounding countryside and work to preserve the proximity and integrity of some of our finest moorlands scenery. Impact on infrastructure - hundreds of new houses will bring thousands of people. Nearby schools and GP surgeries will be put under further strain. Council services, social services and emergency services are already all under great strain. Traffic problems will be made worse. The future - the population of Leek is predicted to rise by a few thousand over the next couple of decades or so. This is mainly due to an ageing population. We are living longer. That means more of the people who are living here now will still be around in 20 or 30 years time. Therefore, planning for the future should be focused on local services for local people. We hope that the Council will heed our objections and explore alternative approaches to housing needs and development in our town. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to the 'Bimby Housing Toolkit' which was drawn up by the Prince's Foundation for Building Community (bimby.org.uk).	Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note these assess the needs of 'older people' and other groups. The June 2014 SHMA concluded the number and proportion of older person households is expected to increase in the District over the period to 2031 (46% increase between 2011 and 2031) which has implications such as increased demand for both specialist/extra-care accommodation for older people, and for adaptable homes. Owing to an ageing population and other factors, the need for smaller units will in future exceed the need for larger, family units. For these reasons the SHMA recommends that 60% of future housing should be 1- or 2-bed. The Council's current Core Strategy Policies expect larger housing schemes to provide for a mix of housing across all locations, to respond to identified local needs such as housing for older people. Note that where there is a policy requirement for affordable housing provision upon such sites, the nature of provision may reflect the above. The BIMBY toolkit is noted. The Council will continue to work with communities seeking to introduce (or influence the preparation of) Neighbourhood Plans, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9104	Mr Robert McGuinness				Object	Email with representation form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sites LE127/LE128A/LE140/LE142A and 'School Site' [presumed LE140] alongside 2015 'Options' sites LE066/LE069/LE128B with the following text: Overdevelopment, traffic congestion issues, inadequate infrastructure, inadequate road network. Brownfield sites and redundant mills should be brought into use first.	• See para response to PO1703 about scale of development • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note site LE069 is not included as allocations in the Local Plan.
PO9089	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9064	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick				Object	I am writing to put forward my opposition to the building of houses on Mount Road in Leek. It upsets me greatly to think that an important local amenity could be lost forever if these proposals go ahead. "The Mount" as we fondly know it, is a valuable asset to the East side of Leek, a wonderful place to take our families for walks and bike rides. In our busy lives, it is vital for our health, both mental and physical to have somewhere to go to relax and unwind. What better place than a walk along the Mount with views over Bradnop and Morridge, so accessible from our homes. If the fields in the planning proposals-LE127, LE128, LE140 and most worryingly on the opposite side LE142 were to be built on then the landscape of our beautiful town will be lost forever. For those arriving in to Leek from Ashbourne Road, they would be met with yet another sprawling housing estate, replacing the picturesque fields full of animals that are so welcoming to see. The road will become a main thoroughfare from the Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road and will lose its charm for us all. Lets protect the gateway to LEEK for generations to come. SAVE THE MOUNT.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9059	Mr Terence Gee				Object	I wish to object to the proposal to build housing on sites LE127,LE128,LE140,LE142a on mount road. This is a green field site with a rural road with unspoilt views only five minutes walk from Pick wood avenue. This road is used regularly by myself and often meet other walkers, cyclists in the area. Also the road would have extra traffic for 500 houses with poor access. There would be increased pressure on local schools,doctors,etc and I feel it would spoil the area with increased urbanisation.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements
PO9072	Mr Stewart Johnson				Object	I am writing to protest against the proposed plans to build 4000 houses in the Leek area:- 1, question how many unoccupied properties are there in the area 2, Loss of beautiful countryside. 3, Work vacancies in the local area. 4, Local infrastructure . 5, Places at local schools. The list is just a few of the considerations the planners seem to be ignoring. Of particular concern is the proposed development along Mount Road. Not only would this destroy a beautiful part of the town used by many residents,it would also cause serious traffic problems both in the immediate vicinity and the rest of the town. These new residents would have to commute,and the main routes would be right through the centre of town adding to an already serious congestion problem. Why do the planners want to destroy the treasure that is The Queen of the Moorlands!	• See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO9080	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9095	Ms Sarah Bishop				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands", Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"! As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land, before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken in to deep consideration before this gem in the town is lost forever.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9315	Ms Emily Hodgkinson						
PO9406	Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9118 PO9230	Mr Robert Barker MRS Karen Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. It is also important to note that TOURISM is a significant driver to the local Economy! Therefore the Town Gateway, especially from the PEAK PARK Buxton Road A53, needs rigorous protection from urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of The Moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive and picturesque and is a key Tourist route. It is also a highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who very regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thornccliffe Road and its' adjoining lanes, and The Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horseriding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicing, and general enjoyment for health and wellbeing. The proposal area, particularly as it approaches the A53 Buxton Road junction with Thornccliffe Road and The Mount, is immediately adjacent to the SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its Historic Landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority in its protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is 'Special' in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There are a number of 'brown' sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. [Question why] these are not shown on the accompanying Consultation Maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be "The Preferred Option Housing Sites" in the view of the residents of Leek. There are also pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the Town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thornccliffe Road and The Mount Road is a Major Intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc.. It would put a major strain onto the area and have significantly adverse effects on the locality. The proposal is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the "housing requirement"[queries this as unjustified] along 1 narrow lane at the most Flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the "brown sites" and protect Leek's Heritage and inheritance!	• See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 about design policies Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about heritage impact considerations • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9132	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed. Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek in this issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9393	Mr Chris Taylor				Support	Land ref LE140: I would support development of this land to the rear of Leek High school. The land is well screened by an established tree belt which must be retained, and on this basis the development would not impact greatly on Mount Road.	Comments noted. The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. • See para response to PO91 about highways
PO9195	Mrs M Motum				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about highways

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE140 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9246 PO9200	Mr John Belfield Mrs Maureen Belfield				Object	The rural fringe of Leek, and specifically Mount Road, would become urbanised. The Mount is a very popular route for leisure activities and exercise for many people and this would be lost. With the enormous number of proposed new houses there would be a massive increase in the amount of traffic both on the mount and also in the surrounding area. Kniveden Lane is already a busy road as it gives access to the small car park at the Moorlands Hospital. This car park is already insufficient for the needs of the hospital and many cars currently park on Kniveden Lane. If hundreds of houses are built on the mount Kniveden Lane would become a significant means of access to Ashbourne Road. The road network would need to be considerably enhanced and part of Kniveden Lane would need to be properly surfaced. This would lead to a major change in traffic patterns in the area which would lead to a loss of public amenity. This would not only cause traffic chaos but would also pollute the surrounding area. It would also make the smaller residential streets of Pitcher Lane and Trafford Close a potential car park for those who currently use Kniveden Lane for this purpose. There are brownfield sites available for building and also more suitable greenfield sites, for example Foker Grange and Home Farm, which have much easier access to the main road network. I therefore object to the building plans on the Mount which are numbered LE142a LE140, LE128a and LE127	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about air quality • See para response to PO9101 about Home Farm

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9338	Mr Derek Kay				Object	Herewith are my objections yet again about building proposals affecting open greenbelt land on Mount Road. I strongly object to delininations LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, on the grounds of unnecessary and deleterious incursion into valuable scenic amenities. The fringes of this town (Queen of the Moorlands) must be preserved at all costs. Open aspects across towards the Peak District are essential for our spiritual wellbeing; unwelcome development of additional traffic flow and population density would be the corollary of this building project, were it to succeed. Conversely, there is much brownfield potential within the town boundary itself; rundown old mills for example (which may be protected by outdated listing orders) and other unsightly structures causing blots on the "townscape". Not enough positive action to clean up the interior of this town has been taken over the years. Use compulsory purchase orders where difficult site owners will not cooperate and make the Queen worthy of her name.	• See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Whilst Councils do retain CPO powers in principle, these are generally used (if at all) as a last resort where it is expedient and in the public interest for the Council to do so, where agreement with landowners is not possible. As explained in response to PO91 the Council makes assumptions that development schemes will come forward within the Leek development boundary to contribute to its housing need to 2031, which could include historic premises etc. Applications affecting listed or non-listed "heritage assets" would be assessed against Section 12 NPPF and Council Policies. The Council would also assess schemes in the town centre against the aspirations of the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9301	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9238	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water Im concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about air quality • See para response to PO680 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response in PO701 about utilities and flood risk The Council must demonstrate to planning inspector that its Local Plan is based on the principles of sustainable development. The NPPF is clear that this means three roles – economic, social, and environmental, and that they are considered simultaneously. The Council's submitted Policies and objectives would therefore have to satisfy this. • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	
PO9181	Mrs E Adams				Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 on design policies
PO9252	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1351 about streetlighting

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	
PO9295	Mrs Gwen Gledhill				Object	Re sites LE127,128,140.142a I wish to object strongly to the proposal to make these sites on The Mount available for housing on the following grounds: 1. Traffic The Mount is a narrow country lane with no pavements and little or no street lighting. There are narrow and dangerous junctions at both ends on to the Buxton and Ashbourne roads and a dangerous bend by LE127. The traffic generated by the proposed 400 houses will completely overload these junctions at busy times and generate a major risk to pedestrians on the lane itself, especially as there is not sufficient width for two cars to pass each other for most of the length of the lane. Commuters travelling from these house to Manchester, Macclesfield or Stoke will only add to the town centre traffic congestion at busy times. 2. The Local Housing Need It is well documented that the local need is for starter homes for young people and 'downsizing' homes for older people. These are not required on the edge of town but need to be closer to the centre where there are shops, amenities and better public transport links. Whatever developers initially propose re 'affordable housing' on The Mount, the reality is that they will ultimately build executive homes attractive to commuters travelling to Manchester, Stoke and beyond at prices cheaper than can be found in Cheshire East! I believe that the buyers will not be local people and thus the developments will not answer the local housing need. There are other sites that could address this need to the south and north west of the town and via infill in the centre itself. Planners should look more carefully at these and not settle quickly for 'easier' options. 3 Our Environment The Mount is a long standing area of natural beauty, accessible to most town residents on foot with views equal to those enjoyed across the Peak District. The developments will ruin this aspect and destroy a major, free, leisure experience for local people right on the edge of The Peak District National Park - their officers will (I'm sure) be objecting too!	• See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO9145 about ageing District population • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9165	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this. Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO91 about air quality • See para response to PO1351 about tree protection • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	
PO9271	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as "Preferred Housing Allocation". There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners. 5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response in PO701 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	- See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
PO9188	Ms Michele Rushton				Object	I wish to register my disapproval re the above development and quite the following points. Loss of an important local amenity – the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by people across the town. Visual impact - restricting important and highly valued panoramic views across the Leek skyline and further afield. Impact on infrastructure - primary schools in particular (East Street, Beresford) will struggle to keep up with demand and the situation where some children already have to travel to schools in the west of Leek will become more and more common Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging High quality landscape – unsympathetic to the landscape character and quality of the area Urbanisation of the country lane that is Mount Road – if all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The spatial distribution of proposed sites across Leek is unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event The volume and speed of traffic is likely to increase on Kniveden Lane where my family have been residents for over 25years. Please for the sake of Leek and her people, review your proposal. Question where are the jobs to support people buying new houses Traffic & congestion through & around Leek is already	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO675 about educational requirements - See para response to PO680 about public rights of way - See para response to PO90 about highways - See para response to PO1676 about viability study - See para response to PO680

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						critical without the addition of more vehicles. Question why can't brownfield sites/old mills etc be converted to housing · I chose to live near Mount Road because I like it as it is, please do not change it!	about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9206	Mr Martin Bagshaw				Object	I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development on the mount area of Leek. I have lived in Leek for all of my life and I and many others , have spent many happy hours enjoying the scenery and tranquility that this area of the town offers to residents of the town. To develop in this area will drastically reduce the local amenity for the residents of the town. It is a lovely picturesque area that is within easy reach of the town centre. And I believe that to destroy it would be an absolute travesty. The area has many amenity uses, such as walking, horse riding, cycling and jogging, let alone just sitting on the benches and chilling. I think the existing schools will struggle to cope with the increased demand for places. The increase the traffic on the roads surrounding the mount will be significant, and traffic calming measures will need to be considered for safety reasons and quality of life of the existing residents in the area. There also be an increase in commuter traffic from this development. I think the majority of which will have to cross the town towards either Stoke on Trent or Cheshire. This will add to the already considerable traffic issues in the town. I believe the Barnfields, the rear of Sainsbury and Foker Grange Farm would be much better locations, so that the increase in traffic is kept away from the town centre. It was my understanding the houses were proposed for the rear of Sainsbury's. But I understand this has hit commercial difficulties with residual contamination.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. • See para response to PO3656 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9174	Mr and Mrs S A Hodgkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have been built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	• See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence The NPPF expects Councils to meet objectively assessed development requirements, and also encourages brownfield development, subject to wider Policies. • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9220	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	• See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9288	Mr Ian Harrison				Object	I hereby which to object to the building of houses etc on The Mount, Leek. This road, used by many is the last place to admire the scenic views of both Leek and the surrounding areas. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. If one site is given permission for house building, then all others will follow and question where will it end. There must be countless brown field sites in the leek area which can be built on first and foremost. If 500 houses were to be built, what happens to Leek. The jobs aren't there, infrastructure, the existing roads can't cope with today's traffic (constant gridlocks in the town centre, never mind 1000 further cars. No hope of a ring road around leek. Junior schools, can't cope with further numbers of school pupils. My wife and I continue to walk over the mount and admire the scenery, as well as the many more who walk, cycle, run and horse ride over it. The new housing would block the outstanding views people go the the mount to view.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE140 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9281	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	• See para response to PO675 about design policies • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement
PO9308	Councillor Gail Lockett				General comment	I have no objections to LE140,	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9323	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example, the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance, for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country" walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built. There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important, local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 about design policies The emerging Local Plan is not yet finalised and needs to undergo independent public examination by Government appointed Planning Inspector before it can become adopted. Planning applications arising before this happens must be determined against the NPPF and current Council planning policies. • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9331	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is a quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about air quality
PO9349	Mr David Rowe				Object	I am writing to object to the selection of all sites on Mount Road, LE127, LE128, LE140 and LE142a. This road is of great value to local people as a very accessible place to experience and benefit from the surrounding countryside. Many people walk, cycle, exercise their dogs along this road every day, and this would be completely lost if development was allowed to take place. There are several brownfield sites in the town that should be considered instead, e.g. the old mills, Barnfields site.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO9206 about existing industrial areas

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9420	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	I am writing to make you aware of the concerns I have over the housing proposals for the Mount Road area, Leek, set out in Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Options and Development Boundaries Consultation. The consequence on traffic of building many houses in the Mount Road area will be very marked both in the immediate area and the town as a whole. Immediate area Mount Road is not wide enough to safely take a major increase in traffic. The road is very popular with walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Increased traffic will discourage such use and be a danger to those leisure users who do continue to use the road. The existing access points to the area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are woefully inadequate and dangerous for high volumes of vehicles. If, as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road would be great. At present the limited amount of traffic means that the restricted visibility due to the trees on Ashbourne Road causes minimal problems. An increase in traffic queues would lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the consequent destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Question where will they go to do these two activities. Work Very few will work in Buxton or Ashbourne which are easily accessible from Mount Road. The vast majority will work in the town centre, the Barnfields industrial estate or on Cheadle Road. Those commuting out of town will be mostly heading for Stoke or Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the centre of town at least twice a day at peak times as there are no alternative routes they can use. Shopping To reach the two large supermarkets in Leek (Morrisons and Sainsbury's) residents of the Mount Road area would be forced, by the road system, to travel through the centre of town. Those shopping further afield will, in the main, be heading for Stoke and Macclesfield and again will need to travel through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that major building to the east of Leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the Mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging sites are LE142b and LE140. Question is there not a possibility of building on the existing sites of Kniveden Hall (which is well screened by trees) and the old Social Services site. These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and in town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway into a linear park (The High Line). Would that Leek had planners and leaders of similar vision to develop Mount Road into The High Lane for	• See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1351 about tree protection • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • Refer to paras 3.20-3.23 of the Preferred Options consultation document regarding additional retail floorspace requirements for Leek. • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142B is of high landscape sensitivity and development could be visible from the peak Park, and the rural approach to Leek;

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE140 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the benefit of all the community.	- LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended; - LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging Local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9425	Mr Michael Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!! There are loads of other areas in Leek that are within the boundaries of Leek and not on green field sites (Huge's Concrete site for one) Leek does not need this amount of housing there is not the work/jobs for the increase in people. This is all about money in the pocket for the council. If we need another primary school increase extend Beresford Memorial school there is about 3 acres of fields behind the school.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO9206 about existing industrial areas • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO675 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO675 about Leek educational requirements
PO9379	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west side of Leek are developable.	• See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The map in the Preferred Options consultation document is intended to illustrate proposed allocations and development boundaries and other summary information, not the extent of land ownerships. • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence.
PO9371	Councillor Rebecca Done				Object	On the proposed planning for the Mount in Leek..I do not agree with and my reasons are stated below: The Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by a lot of people across the town including myself. There will be a massive impact on infrastructure, I think primary schools in particular would suffer (East Street, Beresford) and will struggle to keep up with demand. Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging. If all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The proposed sites across Leek are unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town.	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO675 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO1676 about viability study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9386	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park. The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well as encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO1751 about affordable housing • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1143 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. • See para response to PO91 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9397	Ms Katie Giddings				Object	I wish to register my strong objection to the sites identified for development along The Mount, Leek. The site reference numbers are LE127, LE128, LE140 & LE142a. The Mount is highly valued by the people of Leek. Hundreds of people use it every day & enjoy the landscape and views. These people cover a broad mix - there are walkers & strollers, hikers & joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists - and they range through all ages, from young to old. Generations have taken the air along The Mount and future generations deserve the same opportunity. Chance and regular encounters with this variety of people whose paths would probably otherwise not cross creates the sense of community so often lacking elsewhere but celebrated in Leek. The view of Leek from The Mount creates a sense of belonging to and connection with the whole town, enhancing this sense of belonging. I may not live the other side of Leek but I can see it every time I walk the Mount and feel part of its whole. The town is visible from The Mount & I can enjoy the view of its special architecture & character. This natural landscape is free for everyone to enjoy and is accessible within minutes of the town centre. It is a landscape and community which would be lost forever should the developments go ahead. Such things are irreplaceable and I despair that The Mount is even being considered as a suitable option. I am a recent newcomer to Leek having moved here three years ago. I have never lived anywhere more welcoming and cheerful and full of people appreciating and making the most of living in such a beautiful place. The Mount is at present a country lane offering peace and tranquil exercise. Its urbanisation would completely change its character and make it a main road connecting Ashbourne & Buxton Roads. The traffic increase would be beyond that contributed to by extra housing as it would become a highly attractive route for those seeking to avoid Leek town centre. The access to and from Ashbourne Road would also radically change the character of that end of town. The increased housing would alter the balance of the town and there is simply not that level of demand for housing in that area. The figures of required housing also appear to be based on doubtful statistics so that the very need for this level of housing in the Moorlands is questionable. It would really be dreadful if this so very important natural landscape were to disappear forever from Leek. In conversation with the people I meet along the Mount, there is a strong feeling of being threatened by changes beyond their control & of losing something very precious. Many people have said they have no faith that their feelings and needs will be valued. Please change their minds and show that local people will be listened to and their objections acted upon. Please don't build on The Mount.	• See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about highways • See para response to PO91 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO675 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1351 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9412	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	- See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about air quality
PO9430	Ms Catherine Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!!	- See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO91 about highways - See para response to PO680 on ecology evidence
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as	- See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). - See para response to PO91 on highways

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE140 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO1351 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement • See para response to PO680 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO11	Mr R Goldstraw				Object	I strongly object to The Mount Road in Leek being allocated as a "preferred option" for the new housing allocation. If these developments go ahead it will be a complete betrayal of the people of Leek who have consistently objected to development of this area on the grounds that it would destroy an amenity that has been used for generations. It would ruin forever the far reaching views over Leek and beyond and destroy a popular country walk on the edge of Leek which very many people use on a weekly and daily basis. If this development were to go ahead it would create a rat run between Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road which will make Mount Road unsafe for pedestrians and residents alike. We all know the Councils recent form on "road improvements" in Leek.	The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's emerging Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded site LE142A to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visually prominent and visible from the PDNP, as it is located atop of the ridge that screens views of Leek. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022 /LE127 /LE128

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							/LE140 /LE142A /LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate).
PO92	Mr Bill Reid				Object	This area is a most popular area for walkers, runners, drivers and strollers. It has been, for as long as I can remember, an area that provides views over Leek town and the surrounding area which cannot be equalled. It is a beautiful peaceful part of Leek which should not be spoilt by housing estates and the disruption that goes with it. The top of Kniveden Lane has a piece of unadopted road which deters motorists from using it as a thoroughfare and I am sure that this would become adopted if the proposed plans go ahead causing untold traffic, noise and pollution, as well as the dangers to residents from the traffic. There are many areas around Leek which would be far more suitable.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral “urban extensions” around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3.
PO119	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	No need for more houses in the area. More housing will create more traffic on narrow Mount Road Views and opens spaces should be left as they are for all to enjoy when walking or cycling.	- See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. - See para response to PO11 on highways - See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO11 about public rights of way

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO193	Mr John Pigott				Object	The following comments apply to three areas allocated for housing development on Mount Road: LE127, LE128a and LE142a The proposal to build in these three blocks along both sides of Mount Road should be removed as the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre and is a very popular route for walking, jogging and cycling. It is also on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk giving panoramic views over the centre of Leek and the hills beyond. The Mount is a very important local amenity which has been completely underestimated and its value not understood.. A local resident carried out a head count on Sun 8 th May between 0700 and 2000 and counted a total of 217 people using the road for recreation : 190 walkers (44 with dogs, 8 with prams), 12 cyclists, 12 joggers and 3 horse riders. These were not in organised groups but simply people enjoying the exercise, the views and the fresh air in a safe and sustainable way – no need to get the car out. If the developments proceed then inevitably Mount Road, which is now a country Lane, would be widened and become a busy estate road and people would not want to use it for recreation. Instead of building along Mount Road, the brownfield sites and other sites within the town boundary should be developed first. These include the following sites which were shown on the original plans but now taken out : LE 219, LE073, LE067, LE147, LE037 and LE063	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE127 to be of high landscape sensitivity; as development within the site would likely be visible from the PDNP and could therefore affect its setting - LE128A and LE128B are of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. • See para response to PO11 on highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). Note that site LE073 has since been

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							granted residential planning consent under SMD/2015/0523.
PO229 PO234	Miss Alicia Guy Mr Daniel Frith				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also. It could bring house prices down as at the moment it is such a lovely peaceful area and this no doubt will change	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways • Property values are not considered material in planning law.
PO221	Mr Andrew Bodiam				Object	Like many others I have enjoyed walking on the Mount for 12 years and the planned housing site allocations in this area will completely destroy one of Leek's most valuable assets. Just take a walk along Mount Road and imagine what it would be like with the planned housing in place. I appreciate the Governments requirements but I am far from convinced that Leek's rural countryside should be sacrificed to their cause when there are so many brown field sites available. Furthermore, Leek is not a commuter town and I wonder if there is really the demand for 600 houses especially when those that are for sale take forever to do so. I would therefore ask you to think again.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO682	Andy McGraw				Object	Extension of the Town Boundary into the Natural Zone The following blocks identified as, potentially suitable housing sites, all appear to be outside the town boundary on the maps supplied by the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, on this second housing consultation June 2016 Block numbers; LE 127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a, LE142b All the above mentioned blocks are therefore proposed to be constructed on the Natural Zone land surrounding the town of Leek. Public Amenity The small narrow lane known as Mount Road which travels between the A53 Leek/ Buxton road and A523 Leek/ Ashbourne road along which the following blocks appear, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a, are used on a daily basis as a public amenity. The lane is constantly used by locals and visitors to walk, ride and enjoy the views in relative safety at present. If the proposed housing goes ahead, with the number of houses planned on these sites, this road will undoubtedly suffer a dramatic increase in the number of vehicles using it, by averaging 2 cars per household, thus reducing its safety and relative quiet enjoyment. The views over the town of Leek and its surrounding countryside will also be affected detrimentally. I also note that the lane is included as part of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks, advertised and mapped by the Ordnance Survey as a recreational path but not highlighted as such on the SMDC consultation map. Surely the increase in vehicular traffic would compromise this route. Other public rights of way, public footpaths, are either not shown or seem now to stop at the new development. When I raised the question of this fact at consultation the officer was unable to answer my query. In these times of austerity and the constant cut backs to local government, areas of free enjoyment and recreational use which also merit health benefits need to be conserved. Wildlife Concerns The blocks shown as, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a are frequently used by several bird species, especially during the winter months, as important feeding grounds. Some of these bird species are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CA81) as Schedule 1 protected species, identified by BirdLife International as Globally Threatened species and are listed as Red List species of birds of conservation concern by organisations, the RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), the British Ornithologists Union, Natural England and the British Trust of Ornithology, to name a few. The birds in question are; Fieldfare Turdus pilaris, Schedule 1 W&CA 81 and Red List species Redwing Turdus iliacus , Schedule 1 W&CA81 and Red List Species Starling Sturnus vulgaris, Red List species The small block of land between blocks LE127 and LE128a is also important to wildlife in particular bird species. Although this land is not earmarked for development I feel that the disturbance of the development would compromise the species using it. This small	Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way The consultation map is intended to depict summary information only; it does not for example illustrate public rights of way. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						wooded block is used during the winter months as an important winter roost for a small number of Raven Corus corax, a species again afforded a certain amount of protection. Species using this block to breed include, Little Owl Athene noctua , although not afforded any specific protection via acts of Parliament or listed as a concern yet, it is a species showing major decline, UK population estimated to be down by 24%, as highlighted by the RSPB breeding bird data 1995 – 2008. Great Spotted Woodpecker Dendrocopos major , Nuthatch Sitta europaea, are other examples of regular breeding species in this area. Due to disturbance I predict that many of these species will refrain from using this important area. Infrastructure As mentioned previously the numbers of new houses proposed in the areas of Mount Road and Thorncliffe Road, blocks LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, will put an enormous strain on the local infrastructure and road system. We all constantly experience the difficulties whilst travelling through the town of Leek caused by any one road closure. Both junctions from Mount Road can be difficult to negotiate now with the small amount of traffic using it with the A523 being particularly dangerous in its present form. Problems with access at both these junctions will be severely increased with the increased volume of traffic. At the original consultation July 2015 there was no mention of increasing employment opportunities even when the question was raised. I still feel that these concerns have yet to be addressed. It was implied but not confirmed that most of the individuals who would be residing in the new development would be commuter based, travelling to nearby cities to seek their employment. This surely is contrary to most local government policies that are tasked with reducing this activity to contribute towards climate change and global warming issues. These planned developments will also have a visual, probably a negative impact from the adjoining Peak District National Park as it will be observed from the iconic Roaches and the boundary road of Morridge.	evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements,

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						There seems to be little or no mention of the use of brown field sites throughout the proposal. With the relaxation of planning rules for developing these sites should the Council look to these sites first. Removing deteriorating buildings and areas within the town that look unsightly and replacing with new developments would surely enhance the town, and, as they are close to amenities within the town centre, reduce the need for occupants to use their motor vehicles on shopping trips or evening entertainment. There are also a number of old mills and factories within the existing town boundary that could and should be transformed and upgraded into apartment blocks, as they have in other towns and cities in the UK, which would save those buildings from further degradation, provide perfect housing within the town and help to keep the overall feel of the town and its history. Conclusion In conclusion it is my belief that the proposed development and size of that development will have a serious and negative impact on the market town of Leek and its Natural Zone boundary. As a society in general we are losing touch with nature and the great outdoors. There are Government initiatives to reverse and combat this trend. Organisations, funded by the National Lottery, Government, County and Local councils including SMDC, are tasked to promote these initiatives assisting people to re-engage with nature. We are also constantly reminded these days of health, well-being and mental health issues that our society is increasingly subject too due to the pressures of our modern living and the need for places for people to unwind. With this in mind how can we justify increasing the urban zone into our countryside. We have a duty to protect iconic landscapes, open spaces and the biodiversity such as can be found within the Mount Road area for the future generations of this fantastic town, so that they too, can experience quiet and	to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142A in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						peaceful recreation as we have enjoyed over the years . Maybe the Officers involved in making the final decisions should take an early morning walk along the Mount Road to experience these quiet and peaceful surroundings with the only noise being provided by the local bird-life with their dawn chorus. Once we loose these areas they are lost forever.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO676	Mr Jonathan Hulme				Object	The mount is an important, free, extensively used recreation facility for Leek. The proximity of the mount to the town makes it easily accessible, providing a rural escape for walkers, cyclists, joggers and families alike. This invaluable resource contributes to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all who use it. The mount provides panoramic views of the town and surrounding moor land including the Roches, and housing developments should not encroach on this. The junctions with the A53 and the A523 are also quite dangerous and unsuited to large amounts of traffic. Some form of traffic management would need to be added to these junctions, increasing congestion in and around the town to even higher levels than currently (which is already too high!!). This deters visitors to the town, reducing the amount of tourist trade. The area is also important ecologically and accommodates a variety of species, some of which appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. This excessive allocation of sites appears to be national policy implemented at a local level without consideration of local needs and demographics. The infrastructure in the east of the town is insufficient to cope with a population influx. For instance, the schools and health facilities are already full. Housing development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in the town such as Davenport mill on Mill Street and the mill on Ashbourne Road. The developers who own these sites should be incentivised to commence development. Redevelop eyesores, don't diminish beauty spots.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO702	Mr John Burnett				Object	This existing field forms an intrinsic part of the open space known as the Mount. As such it provides views over Morridge and out to the Peak district and for users of the Mount affords an area of outstanding natural beauty. Building on this plot of land would severely restrict the views available and would mean that use of the Mount Road as an exercise and recreation facility would be severely restricted. I would also object based on my concerns that building in this location would have severe impact on both existing infrastructure including roads and schools and would affect the ground water run off causing issues in other areas of the town. Building on this land would demonstrably damage the aspirations of the local community and would have severe economic and environmental consequences - completely at odds with the objectives of the consultation.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that subsequent development proposals would be required to integrate sustainable drainage features into layouts, as required by the Flood and Water Management Act. • See para response to PO682 about economic benefits of housebuilding
PO1320	Mr Stapleton	Leek And District Civic Society			Object	I write on behalf of Leek & District Civic Society to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision to include The Mount' Leek as a preferred option for housing development. This area is heavily used by recreational walkers and is the sort of local amenity which would be absolutely spoilt by additional building. Leek has few enough open spaces as it is and the loss of The Mount would be completely unjustifiable. Of all the site options in the Leek area, The Mount is the one which we feel should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected for the present populace and future generations.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1350	Mr A Birks				Object	This morning whilst taking my constitutional stroll around Mount Road I happened upon a group of people considering the best plots to build houses in this beauty spot. One member of the group introduced herself as a local councillor. My heart sank as it became clear that some minds at least, against the wishes of the local people, the decision to build seems to have been taken. It is outrageous that the local community is once again to be ignored by those elected to serve us. Mount Road is a very important part of the social scene of Leek as local people use it daily to enjoy the countryside which is within their homes. It would be an ecological and social outrage to remove this facility from the people of Leek. This area is more important to the wellbeing of residents from across the town than any other area around Leek as it is their gateway to a relaxed walk in the fresh air in the countryside. Any development of this area would change the nature of Leek as it would necessitate the widening of the road, the installation of lighting and the uprooting of that special commodity trees. The Mount Road would be a major thoroughfare between the Ashbourne Road, and Buxton Road, Kniveden Lane. Would be a conduit between the same roads meaning heavy traffic rushing through the estate and there would be a problems caused by necessary construction of major road junctions at each end of the Mount Road. Local residents this would be a disaster. There is a concern too that, with the addition of a large number of houses in this area, the infrastructure at this end of town would be challenged beyond its ability to cope. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very full and recent queues of vehicles to get into town were horrendous during the roadworks in the town. Imagine the chaos should we add another 500 families in the queue. In the unlikely event that Leek should actually need extra accommodation, consideration should be given to brownfields or less intrusive sites first. There are several derelict mills which could be utilised for apartments or demolished for housing. The infrastructure of drains, electricity and gas is readily available near these 2 areas too. I appeal to the council to reflect on the wishes of those who elected them to serve their needs and reject the idea of developing this area and retain it for enjoyment and health of the many people of Leek who appreciate it.	- See para response to PO11 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement - See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence See para response to PO11 about highways Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. - See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO676 about educational requirements - See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence
PO963	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				Object	Do not build on.	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1142	Mr R Harrison				Object	I have recently looked at the site plans and talked to one of your officers concerning the location: This is a narrow road, used by many recreational purposes such as walking, cycling The views over Leek Conservation area and its surrounding area are 2nd to none both night and day There have been lots of houses built on the east side of Leek in recent years mainly off Ashbourne road. As the majority of people travel to Macclesfield, Manchester and Stoke on Trent to work, this means they have to travel through the centre and often Leek is gridlocked at busy times The exits from the Mount onto Buxton and the Ashbourne Roads are both very narrow and difficult to negotiate. Schools at the end of the town are already full to capacity and young children have to be taken across Leek early in the morning and collected in the evening. Drs Lists are so full. We are told that some of these houses are possible affordable housing. What does this mean? There are plenty of small terrace houses on the market which I would consider as affordable. So do we need more? In fact do we need a 1000 new houses to in Leek at all anywhere? If so I would like to think that there are possible sites in Leek - West End could be given consideration before further action is taken. Leek is a beautiful small town with easy access to countryside. By allowing building on The Mount Road that access will be diminished as more of our green fields turned into housing developments and country roads become clogged with vehicles. Where will it end?	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements The Council consults with its Housing Officer when setting definitions of 'affordable' in relation to affordable housing. This usually equates to a percentage of open market value which represents the upper limit that the house can be sold/resold for. An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO946	Mr Chris Clark				Object	Building houses at this location would permanently destroy the rural aspect of Mount Road, which is used by walkers on a daily basis. Mount Road is easy to access by residents living towards the north and east of the town, and is an irreplaceable asset to the people of Leek. If houses were to be built here, most residents would work in Stoke-on-Trent (or Macclesfield) and therefore commute through Leek's town centre, adding to existing congestion.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO11 on highways
PO1574	Mrs S Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount. It is a icon beauty spot, Leek's gateway into the open country side and has been popular with walkers, joggers, cyclist and horse riding for generations and should be protected for future generations to I strongly recommend further consideration be given to the developing the empty mills, brownfield Sites and making use of the many vacant homes in the Moorlands before surrendering our precious Greenfields to hungry developers	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1577	Mr PJ Chauveau						
PO1683	Mr N A Brundrett				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. The grounds for that are:	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1350 about streetlighting • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way
PO1677	MRS A Staton					Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town.	
PO1653	Mrs G Webster					Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting.	
PO1647	Mrs J Lownds						
PO1640	Mr W Johnson						
PO1671	Mr S Panek					Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1 st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of Leek will become more common. Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular	
PO166	Mr A						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
4	Panek					route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking.	
PO1659	Miss J Panek					High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area. Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments proceed then the 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event. The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	• See para response to PO676 about design policies • See para response to PO11 about highways The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
PO4770	Mrs A Lomas						
PO4758	Mr & Mrs P & J Whitehurst						
PO4754	Miss L Whitehurst						
PO1686	Mr David Morgan				Object	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to build houses on the Mount. I specifically object to the building off houses on sites: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. When I first heard about the proposal to build in this area. I was genuinely shocked and still cannot believe that the proposal have been submitted to build on such beautiful landscape which has helped to shape leeks identity as Queen Of the moorlands. I work in the local community and I have not heard a single resident of Leek express support for these proposals – they have expressed deep anger and concern. I live locally to the Mount and regularly take walks there and it is very clearly, a popular destination for walkers and cyclist. However, I do not feel that this is area that is solely of Leek by these who live in its vicinity. I believe that the mount is an area that the people of Leek genuinely cherish and it would be a tragedy if a major housing development were built along it, The Mount does provide an important amenity for local residents including Hargate estate. I feel it would be unacceptable to build houses on it, spoiling the unspoilt beauty of the area and leading to a huge increase in the traffic which would obviously cause a major hazard to walkers and cyclist. I feel it is unacceptable to deprive residents of a very built up area such as Haregate estate of the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful country side and open space this that the mount offers. If this proposal is passed then I feel that the character and identity of Leek will be very adversely affected and this will have a very detrimental impact on its image in terms of visitors and attracting business	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO676 on design policies

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1283	Mrs B Ward				Object	I write once again to protest against the proposed development of housing along and off mount road. We have already had 2 public enquires and each time the inspector has upheld the decision not to allow these fields to develop along mount road. This is a great amenity for the town, especially for residents this side of leek. I feel that we have been left a short stretch off mount road but with all the roads going off it Mount Road itself will probably have to be widened and will become a bi pass for traffic between Buxton Road. Walking along a country lane enjoying the views. Do people walk as much on the other side of town? Aren't there still places for the development within the town? Not touching our open spaces. Where are 600 new houses on Mount Road going to work?	The Council must justify proposed land allocations which form part of its new Local Plan to planning inspector during public examination of the Local Plan. The Inspector must consider the 'soundness' of the Plan as per para 182 NPPF. Note that as part of this process the Council must demonstrate that it meets its objectively assessed development requirements for housing (and other land uses) for the District. • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1470	Mrs G Armstrong				Object	As a resident of Moorland Road since 1975, I write to you to express my concerns over the appalling plan to yet again to destroy an area of the town much loved and frequented by its residents for countless generations. I can assure you that the contents of the letter not only reflect the views of me and the residents of moorland road and Kniveden Lane but those of leek in general. The proposal to build 400 houses on the Mount came as a shock to the town. Whilst I am not opposed to the idea of providing some housing in the Leek area, I cannot equate with the requirement for the number your department are planning. As regards the location, how can you say that a beautiful location like the Mount is in need of development when there are numerous locations that in the area that are an eyesore and would be more than fit the bill for re development? If your department were to take the time too canvas the people of leek you would find that it is considered an asset to this town. The Mount is an area of outstanding rural beauty with great views across the town, supporting an abundance of wildlife whose habitat would be destroyed if the plan goes ahead. It has long been a source of relaxation, leisure, exercise, and even welcomes retreats for courting couples and families with children or people exercising their pets can be seen walking the Mount in complete safety without the fear of being subjected to danger from large numbers of cars. This would change if the whole scheme goes ahead. Is it right that future generations should be denied the pleasure their forebears derived from this beautiful road, With an average of each household owning 2 cars each the paln to build 400	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						residents could unleash about 800 vehicles all trying to support those numbers. Mount road would be saturated with vehicles all trying to leave either via the junction with the A523 Ashbourne Road or the A53 Buxton Road. Both roads are very busy main roads. After frustration of accessing these knock on effect would choke the town centre which struggles now at certain times to maintain a smooth flow. No doubt the un adapted and unmade section of Kniveden Lane would be upgraded encouraging it to be used as a short cut between Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road. The only thing that stops it being a rat track now is that it is unmade and has ruts and pot holes. Also of concern is that with this sort of development you require to provide a proportion for social housing. We all know who are housed in these and what effect it has on the surrounding area. I need say no more. Can you explain why there seems determination within the planning bodies to destroy what is beautiful and precious to the people of Leek with total disregard to the preservation of the environment and wishes of the Leek populace. If they want to improve this town why don't they concentrate on some of those areas in dire need of redevelopment and of which there are many in this town. I along with the majority of the other house owners in the vicinity, share at the lack of the thought that has obviously not been thought that has gone into this project. I ask the question; have any of the councillors or those on the planning dep actually bothered to walk to location, to see for themselves what they would be destroying and ask residents for their thoughts. No, I doubt it very much if this is the case. Is it just a figure on the map to them? I understand that the majority are not from Leek and so don't really have its best interests at heart. These so called councillors were voted in to represent the towns folk and listen to their view. This has not obviously been thought out thoroughly and it makes me wonder what sort of people will be running the council. Is it yet again something to their advantage and not that of the town. Their priorities do not appear to be the people of Leek there to represent them. I make this representation not only on behalf of those directly affected but also the people of Leek who are totally opposed to this desecration of one of the most beautiful and well-loved areas.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1522	Ms Angie Guest				Object	Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of Leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2 nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about highways
PO1500	MRS KAREN BARKER				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. There is much greater need for jobs/employment as priority in the town if people are to be enticed to come to live here by large scale housing developments. There are presently not enough jobs locally to adequately provide for the current housing occupants. There is likely to be an increased need for Housing Benefits affecting the local economy together with significant increased pressure on infrastructure due to need for travel in and out of the area for work. It is also important to note tourism is a significant driver to the local economy! Therefore the town gateway, especially from the Peak Park Buxton road A53, needs to be rigorous protection from the urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of the moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive picturesque and Tourist Route. It is also highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thorncliffe Road and its adjoining lanes, the Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horse-riding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicking and general enjoyment of for health and well-being. The proposed areas particularly as it approaches the a53 Buxton Road junction with Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road, is immediately adjacent to a landscape area which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its historic landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is special in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There is a number of brownfield sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. For some reason? These are not shown on the accompanying consultation maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common	• See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO676 about design policies Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						knowledge along with the fact that these would be 'the preferred option housing sites' in view of the residents of leek. There are also pockets of green belt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitively to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road is a major intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc. The proposal will is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the housing requirement? Unjustified along 1 narrow lane at the most flagship side of leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the brownfield sites and protect leeks heritage and inheritance!	- about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO193 about heritage impact considerations • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements
PO1401	Mrs Smith	M			Object	With regard to the proposed 400 plus houses to be built on the mount, I would like to express my concerns on the matter. I can't help but for see the problems 400 to 800 cars will create, trying to leave Mount Road to gain access to the Buxton Road. They will be queuing up! Most families these days have at least one car some have two. Mount Road was not built for such traffic	• See para response to PO11 about highways
PO1711	Mr Carding	G			Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on Mount Road leek. The Mount has been a historic to the people of leek for generations for its 360 degree panoramic views of natural beauty. Being born in Leek I have walked over the mount all my life and always enjoyed the peace and quiet surrounded by the countryside views which are irreplaceable building housing in this area would also destroy the wildlife and a result in the loss of open space. This road is unsuitable for the large volume of traffic which would be generated by all the new houses and is narrow in places with dangerous junctions at both end of the road. The roads in this part cannot take any more traffic. Please find more suitable site within the town, if we keep building out into the countryside where will the border of Leek End? Ashbourne	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways
PO1486	Mrs Lane	C			Object	I object to any housing being built in this area. It is an area used by many people for walking etc. – many for health reasons e.g. for me. We must keep our open spaces that are in walking distance of our town, once lost – gone forever. Don't let us loose it	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1698	Mr Michael Owen				Object	My wife and I would like to tender our personal objections to any proposed house building along Mount Road Leek. We don't feel that the area has infrastructure to cope with the number of houses proposed and would spoil the landscape of a very popular and picturesque area used extensively by Leek residents	• See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9421	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	LE142b, le142a, le140, Le128a, Le022, Le127 I write to object to the proposal to all the building of housed along mount road as set out in the preferred options doc. My 2 main objections are based on the implications for the environment and the traffic. Environment – For generations Mount Road has been a favourite walking/cycling/horse riding route for many residents of Leek. It is easily accessible (not requiring a car to reach it) and is quiet safe place by way which can be used by all people of all ages in all weathers. The major attraction is walkers are the outstanding vista the road provides both town and county. The proposed building at the north would destroy the turn the road into a noisy, busy thoroughfare, that would be unsafe and unpleasant for walkers and all over leisure users. The proposed housing at the southern end of the road would mean the views of the town would be lost. At a time when all our members of society are being encouraged to take more exercise the destruction of the mount is free, natural gym, seems very short sighted. Immediate area Mount road is not a wide enough area to safely take a major increase in traffic. The existing access points to this area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are wholly inadequate and dangerous for the high volume of vehicles. If as is most likely, Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road causes minimal amount of problems. An increase in traffic will queues will lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Where will they go to do these activities? Traffic The consequences of the traffic of building many houses both in the immediate area and the town as whole will be very marked. Work Very few work in Buxton or Ashbourne which re easily accessible from the mount. The vast majority work in the town centre, the barn field's industrial estate or on Cheadle road. Those commuting out of the town centre will be heading mostly to stoke Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the town centre at least twice a day at peak times as there are no alternative routes they can use. Shopping To reach the two large supermarkets in Leek (Morrisons and Sainsbury's) residents of the Mount Road area would be forced, by the road system, to travel through the centre of town. Those shopping	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO676 on design policies • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1350 about tree protection • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142B is of high landscape sensitivity and development could be visible from the peak Park, and the rural approach to Leek; - LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended; - LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142A in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						further afield will, in the main, be heading for Stoke and Macclesfield and again will need to travel through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that the major building works to the east of leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging site LE142b and LE140. Is there not a possibility of the building on the site existing site of Kniveden Hall (which is screened of by trees) and the old Social Services building? These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and still generate a lot more traffic throughout the town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway in a linear park (the high lane). Would that Leek had planners and leader of similar vision to develop mount road into a high lane for the benefit all off the community	Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging Local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO173 1	Mrs Mary Emery				Object	LE066, LE067, LE068, LE143a, LE127, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of the land on The Mount My reasons are as follows. There are sufficient brown field site available, such as The former Just juice site on Prince Street is now vacant The former Big Mill on Mill Street, ripe for development The former Brough, Nicolson and Hall Mill on Ashbourne Road A reasonable plot of land on the Organ Ground which was the former East Street Nursery which is now vacant. Shortly to become available the former Britannia Building Society plot of land on Cheddleton Road Land on Foker Grange on Macclesfield road The Mount is a valued area of outstanding beauty and must be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is supposed to be green belt land; consideration that seems to have been overlooked. I would like to point out the impact of the proposed development would have on local services i.e. schools, GP services, the road infrastructure and employment needs. I am also very concerned about the effect on the local wildlife,, the increase in traffic, and noise levels this development will bring. I would like to know what happened to the housing development at the Sainsbury's site, which never seems to have transpired	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE143A, and sites LE067/LE068 are not formally identified as they fall within the town boundary (see para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance). Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note the former Britannia premises on both sides of the Cheddleton Rd are both preferred mixed employment/housing allocations, refs LE150 and LE235. • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways • The noise impacts of schemes would be assessed against the Council's adopted amenity Policies and NPPF Policies The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121
PO172 1	Mr & Mrs V and J Emery						

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142A in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1766	Mr and Mrs W Lovatt				Object	LE127, LE069, LE128, LE140, LE066, LE142a, LE142b We would like to submit our comments concerning the above consultations with the specific regard to leek east. These consultations with specific regard to leek Ease and the area of mount road. This is a semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of the attractions of this area of leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10mnutes walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking jogging and cycling. This is a important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to a nature very close to the heart of leek. The views from the mount are spectacular and largely unspoilt. Any developments of any of all the listed developments of the type proposed would totally alter the area, as it has with the Buxton Road end of Mount road. If all the development listed above were to proceed. In excess 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development especially on the bad junction where mount road meets Ashbourne road near Poplar Service Station.. Access via the already existing estate off kniveden lane and or High View road and Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature off the roads in question and the cars parked on either side of the roads in what is a already busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious consequences Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land that would be ideal for development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development would be ideal of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities and would be more sustainable as they would result from a increase in traffic in outlying areas. Given to the employment situation in Leek, a large proportion of these would inevitably be homes for communities for the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would ruin the character and community feel of the area. Given the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable housing in rural locations, more consideration should be given this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this town.	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE069. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways Leek is already served by a number of frequent or less frequent bus routes, connecting to centres such as Hanley, Cheadle, Buxton and Macclesfield. A number of these use main arterial routes such as Buxton Road /Ashbourne Road /Springfield Road. In some circumstances, major residential developments may be required to contribute to improved bus routes/bus facilities in accordance with emerging Local Plan Pol T1/Staffordshire Local Transport Plan. • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about design policies • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing
PO1759	Mrs J Lovatt						
PO1774	Mr S Lovatt						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1559	Miss A Hampson				Object	Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO11 on highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1554	Mrs G Webster				Object	I have never protested before but I feel compelled to write this let reg the proposed developments across the mount. When I was young I lived on Haregate Est and many times my parents took my siblings and I across the mount it was something we enjoyed seeing all the farm animal and wildlife. As I got older I would still walk the mount and dream of one day owning one of the houses which were only a couple of minutes' walk away from being in the countryside. That dream was realised in 1976. Now I am retired it is wonderful to be able to stroll round the mount each day. My husband twice a day come rain or shine, and able to do just that take in the views or have conversations with people we meet, not just from this area but from other parts of town. It is good for the soul as well as the mind. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is precious and should be protected for future generations 'never know what you have got till it's gone' comes to mind as was the case with what was a beautiful roundabout which stood proud at the top off Derby St. Do we need so many more houses in leek if so we do not build on the field opposite the cricket club on Macclesfield Road which would not have the catastrophic impact of hundreds of houses on the mount or why not build them on Blackshaw Moor where there is already a small estate. I hope this marvellous asset treasured by so many can be saved for the town and the people of Leek.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt Blackshaw Moor is identified as a 'smaller village' in the Council's emerging Local Plan and should only attract a limited amount of additional housing within or around the built up area. Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1515	Mrs J Pointon				Object	We are writing to vehemently object to any planned housing on green fields along the Mount. This not only is a beautiful area on the edge of the town but also sustains farming and livestock crucial to our economy. There are within the town, sufficient brownfield sites and redundant mills to accommodate any development not to mention the 182 houses currently for sale within Leeks boundary together with the 56 properties up for rent. We would like to ask the council where these people are going to come from to buy these additional properties and where are they going to work being as Leek has a very little industry left. One other thing that has come to our attention is why is there is one rule for some and another ruled for someone else. I refer to the issue involving C & R Haulage at Werrington. A company which deals with agriculture and the transport of livestock who have been seeking to obtain planning permission to park their lorries on a small holding in the area to enable them to look after any livestock they have overnight but who have been refuses this application on the grounds that the property is green belt land by ac council that is contemplating building houses outside environs of the town on green belt land. There seems to be no consistency whatsoever to your planning guidelines and we ask that this should be explained.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements All planning applications must be assessed against current Local Plan Policy and the NPPF. The reasons behind individual planning decisions can be viewed at http://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/smdc-aurora . The Council must justify proposed land allocations which form part of its new Local Plan to planning inspector during public examination of the Local Plan. The Inspector must consider the 'soundness' of the Plan as per para 182 NPPF. Note that as part of this process the Council must demonstrate that it meets its objectively assessed development requirements for housing (and other land uses) for the District.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1535	Mrs C Whitehurst				Object	I am disappointed that local objections to development along Mount Road leek have been ignored by those who claim to represent us, and I must once again voice my objections. The Mount is one of our most beautiful and well-loved amenities for local walkers, cyclist, runners and dog walkers. A short walk from town which I personally use at least 3 times a week whenever I walk around I meet at least 10-12 others. It is also a safe route to take children of all ages to appreciate the country side, farm use and wonderful views – all of which will disappear. Many habitants for small animals and birds will go along the grass verges and lost trees, so much for our greener landscapes. Who is going to buy these obviously very expensive houses not my children who can hardly afford to rent never mind buy? But I'm sure the overspill from Macclesfield, Manchester + Buxton will appreciate these cheaper houses than they can afford there. Where will all the children go to school our local ones are full and have little or no space to expand, more Drs and Dentists will be needed. Traffic along the mount will be busy. It has already increased during times of the road closures repairs etc, and now this new short out has been found it will continue to be used. As there are now plans in place to convert several old apartments such as old Mills in the town a large number of houses will not be needed by local people and smaller brown field sites can be found in and around leek for a much more acceptable amount rather than such a large estate. If the £1000 per house built is so tempting why not just ask us for more council tax – I'm sure most people would be willing to pay to save this precious area for our children and grandchildren. I would. Please please listen to our objections regarding this atrocity in our wonderful town.	• See para response to PO11 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1350 about tree protection • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus
PO1543	Mrs C Keates				Object	The Mount is a very important area for the town of leek. This whole area is an important amenity area for the town – it was promised a few years ago that there will be no further development after the completion of Mountside gardens. Further developments' will destroy the open views of the Morridge from the town. Some of the areas highlighted for development was gifted to the town presumably to protect them and for agricultural use. Development of the Mount will lead to greatly increased traffic on what is basically a country lane. Safety issues at both junctions. The importance of the local people who use it. Young walkers, runners, joggers, cyclist, horse riding, dog walkers. These include singles, couple. Family groups and organised walking groups aside. We urge you to look at these plans very carefully before you decide to ruin this beautiful area. Surely there are other smaller areas which could be utilized for future needs.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1489	Ms Dawn Garrett				Object	I write with reference to the planning proposals along The Mount in Leek. I moved to Leek last August, the countryside being one of the big draws. I'm dismayed to find that my favourite dog walk is earmarked for extensive development. The absolutely magnificent views would be lost forever. The birdsong drowned out by the inevitable increased traffic load. The wildflowers at the side of the road and the sheep peacefully grazing, all gone. The creeping urbanisation of such a lovely country town is a big worry. Surely it would be better environmental sense to deal with the falling-down mills and derelict housing in the town before building any further? Regeneration is a much more modern concept and would further revitalise the town itself. For me and my family access to the views, the fresh air and the wildlife is balm against our stressful and hectic working lives. I live on Ashbourne Road so this is not NIMBYism at work, it is a genuine plea to save this lovely area for everyone. Now and in the future.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence
PO1584	Mr C Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I love to go running there with my dad and really enjoy the view into open countryside.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence
PO1587	Mr J Jones				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence
PO1593	Mr L Emerick				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected. My family often take our dog for walks there and feel it should be protected	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence
PO1599	Mrs J Smith				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence
PO1604	Mr J Mays-Woodhead				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1695	Ms Machin	K			Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on the mount road, leek as outlined in the preferred options site and boundaries of staffs moorlands local plans – sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. This area should not be built on as it will ruin the lovely views over Leek and the Horizon and has been enjoyed for generations by walker's cyclist etc, who on a nice day vastly outnumber cars on this stretch of road. This road also appears to be outside the site boundary. By building approx. 400 houses it will no longer be a country walk yet another housing est. The council should be committed to maintaining green belt land and encouraging people to get fresh air and exercise in an age increasing obesity. There are surely plenty of empty mills and brownfield or former industrial sites within the town which could be developed for housing instead of building on open fields. There is also no development proposed in the west end of leek-why not? The planners need to go back to their drawing board and identify more suitable sites across the whole leek instead of concentrating on the one unsuitable area. Please save the mount	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1709	Mr Hoggarth	C			Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A I am writing to you with regards to you with my objection to the proposed sites above for housing development that I consider will result in loss of countryside e an recreational amenity to local residents. My objections consist of 3 main concerns: The loss of green field sites. The enclosure of the open space that is mount road. The loss of recreational amenity of Mount Road through the amount of additional traffic. The areas of land in question is border Mount Road, a low traffic route with broad open views across countryside to the east over the town of Leek and beyond to its west. Mount Road well known locally for the pleasurable route for exercise it provides and is much used by local residents and visitors. Enclosure with housing development would turn an open country lane into just another urban roadway and would destroy the views reducing the attraction of the area. The associated increase in the traffic would severely reduce the safety route. I consider that the cumulative effect would be to destroy the area as a recreational amenity. Of the area surrounding the current town boundaries, I think that this is one that would constitute the greatest loss, both with respect to the beauty of the outlook and the loss of its use for recreation. Mount Road is a beautiful location; visitors jealously comment how lucky I am to have such an area on my doorstep. To destroy it would be a disgrace and I hope you will reconsider the proposals	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1702	Mrs J McGuinness				Object	Ref: LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A. As a local resident in objection to the above proposed plans For the Mount in Leek. I object to the scale of development for this beautiful country lane on the outskirts of our town. It is a area of outstanding beauty, boasting much wildlife, flora and fauna. The woodland and hedgerows are home to valued wildlife and birds. In addition there are farm animals, bats, foxes, stoats, mice all of which inhabit this area has been identified over existing brownfield sites in town. Could the planners not relax the rules and allow sites in town that have been previously been refused for development? Do we really need 400 houses? Do we really need another 1 st school, at this end of the town? I am dubious as there are as many properties in the town already for sale, unoccupied or derelict. Where are all the people coming from to buy these 400 houses? My main objection is the sheer volume of traffic. The roads are totally unsuitable to accommodate the amount of traffic that's will be generated by a school and 400 houses. This development has the potential to create at least 800 cars from the proposed housing development (average 2 cars per house hold) and even more generated from schools with staff and pupils, including the cars school buses . The lane is already suffers from many vehicles using the lane, as a rat run and this will increase. In addition to being a resident The Mount I am also a daily dog walker and I am concerned for the safety of those using the lane for leisure, i.e walker, dog walkers, joggers, mums with little ones, cyclists, horse riders and those coming to sit on the seats provided to take in the beautiful views. If development goes ahead these activities will come to an end and once again our green landscape will disappear with the town boundaries being pushed out further and further. Where will local people be able to go without getting into these cars and causing more traffic congestion on the roads, and what about those without transport? The road junction at either end of the Mount are not without difficulties. The Buxton Road junctions Is a staggered cross roads with Novi Lane and needs to be approached with caution. At school times It is used by parents/carers/school buses. I cannot imagine the chaos that will transpire if another school is permitted on the Mount – it will certainly become a lot busier and more dangerous. Do we really want to put our children at risk? Walking to and from school will not be a solution as it will be to dangerous. Let us not forget that in additions to this road junction, a short distance down the same road Churnet View transport comes onto the Buxton Road via Abbotts Road, and Leek High/The Meadows/East St 1 st School all feed into and use Buxton Road via Springfield Road. Each school has buses/taxis and cars transporting pupils and the volume using the roads at the same time of day has potential to cause bottle necks on this busy main road. Another school shall mean 7 school all using the same road – local residents will have to keep of the road to the volume of traffic down. The other end of the mount leads to Ashbourne road and this junction not only has obscured visual	It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						access but a difficult angled junction. Surely this is totally unsuitable to transport large volumes of traffic which will be generated from 400 houses and a school! If a alternative junction is proposed this can only be achieved by sacrificing another green field. The Mount, Ashbourne Road are all used by big lorries, buses, tractors, trailers, farm stock to and from stock market, farm machinery, lorries transporting goods to and from Buxton, Ashbourne, and Surrounding areas. These are very busy roads! Can we really add to this without causing major problems? I urge the council to consider these proposals very carefully giving due time and consideration to alternative sites in town, because once the boxes are ticked it will be irreversible and the mount will be changed forever.	
PO1740	Mr Martin Armstrong				Object	LE127, LE128A, LE142A, LE142B Why turn a place of beauty into an eyesore when the council should be concentrating on transforming areas which are an eyesore into places of beauty. There are so many alternatives to the proposed sites for housing development around leek is without having to take away Leeks most cherished leisure route. Mount Road has long been a source of relaxation, leisure and exercise to the residents of Leek It is used daily by scores of locals who walk, run, cycle, and enjoy the tranquillity of this country lane which provides fantastic views across Leek and towards the peak district. Where else in the area is there such an amenity so conveniently within walking distance and safe for people to enjoy. The Mount is also a natural habitat for wildlife including many endangered species. The like of owls, woodpeckers and many more other birds and small mammals would be severely put to risk and their habitat will be seriously damaged. This proposed totally unnecessary housing development would not only destroy all this but also a place extra stress on the town centre already, struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra stress owns the town struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra vehicles would adversely affect road safety and be a danger to the public particularly on both exits from Mount Road. These are but a few of the issues generated by this ill thought out scheme	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO11 on highways
PO1716	Miss JM Botham				Object	With reference to the proposal for the mount new housing development This is and has been a delightful walk for the people of leek for many years. The older generation will have fond and lasting memories of the courtships over the mount. We as children used it for walking and horse riding in safety to go further afield to Cheddleton Heath. We know in recent times it is an it is a popular route of the Staffordshire moorlands walk. We believe more ought to be done with the brown fields site this would clear unsightly buildings and In most cases be more convenient to the town allowing for less use of vehicles and allowing for the green areas to be maintained for leisure pursuits.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2586	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2901	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	The allocations proposed around Mount Road will necessitate highway improvements for example road widening, provision of footways, completing Kniveden Lane to adoptable standard, possible (probable) junction improvements at one or both ends. The removal of the sites between LE127 and LE128a could make the delivery of the required scheme more complicated and therefore requires further consideration including the reinstatement of sites LE069 & LE128b.	Comments noted. See para response to PO91 about highways. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount are not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3654	Mr P Ash				Object	My husband and I most strongly oppose the number of sites on Mount Road, Leek as preferred option for new homes. Both of us have lived in Leek all our lives and for the past 50 years have resided on the Moorland Road. Mount Road is acknowledged as an area of open space for walking, cycling, and jogging and it is a area of free from volumes of traffic? I know my mother exercised, pushing me in my pram walking round the Mount. Building houses either side of the road would most likely make the Mount Road into a main road linking Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road. This road is not sustainable not wide enough to take heavy vehicles and constant stream of Traffic, if numerous houses were to be built either side for Health and Safety reason would require pavements, gutters and drainage all of which will narrow, the width of the road for vehicles, in all probability each house will have 2 cars, which again will increase the flow of traffic. To surface the top of Kniveden lane would make this road a rat race and a highway leading to an increase of even more traffic may I remind the council that when the developers applied for planning permission to build homes on the land behind sunny view at the end of Ashbourne Road – grave concern was exposed by Staffordshire County Council of traffic from the houses converging onto a busy main road, would that not also apply to traffic from the houses converging onto 2 main roads – Ashbourne road,, and at the other end of Buxton road. I would like to draw your attention to the fact when Mr William Milnes gave the land he owned to the council, land where now stands Leek High School, and is playing fields which borders Kniveden Lane and extend on the Mount, there was a clause in the gift of land that this land would be only used for educational purposes. One may also ask the council "where are all families and buyers that require these houses? Leek has not the facilities to accommodate such a huge increase in its population. The Dr's are already working to their full capacity, which schools primary and senior have places for an increase in children of school age? And where will the new comers to the area, travelling from the Mount to Macclesfield or to the potteries will increase the flow of traffic though the centre of the town these were problems with planning permission to build house on ?? At Leek brook on the site of Joshua Wardens factory, as to the nature of the ground and the fact the earth may have become contaminated from factory work etc. These problems were overcome and rectified and houses were built. Now houses cannot build on this land surrounding Sainsbury's Supermarket because of problems with the land – if land at Leekbrook can overcome the problems with the land around Sainsbury's overcome the problem? And houses can be built on land previously occupied and accommodating buildings.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways The Council is not aware of any legal encumbrances upon this site. • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1731 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3695	Mrs Ryan	C			Object	I am writing to express my objection to recently published plans to build on a large area of the Mount in Leek. Whilst understanding there is a need for some new housing, I feel this area is the wrong place and definitely too extensive. A few points I would like to share which may not take into account the professional opinion but a certainly take a common sense view. The Sainsbury's site was passed as a area for retail and business development with a to build on a small housing estate. This has not been fully developed and I understand it may because there are issues with asbestos and or some other contamination. Yet it seems it is fit for a pub selling food, a children's party play area and a supermarket selling some other consumable goods. If it is the case that there have been some bad decisions made around this site, the council officers responsible for passing this plan should own up and ensure this site is cleaned up. Enabling the plans many locals objected to, be completed. Of course this will mean a cost to the taxpayers whom are left carrying the financial burden of bad decisions made. I have no objection Education Land boarding Mount Road being to extend or build a primary school as have a shortage of places, the concern would be of increased traffic and the requirement for good provision of off road parking at the school if there were to be an entrance on that road. There is a site on the Buxton road Blackshaw Moor which has stood unused for many years since the Army ceased training there. It must have drainage, electrics and water on this site. This would be ideal for a small scale affordable housing site. It would also benefit the local school which has a small numbers of pupils and probably in danger of being closed in years to come Transport should not be a issue because there some buses to Buxton and local bus companies can benefit by providing peak time services. There must be other sites within Leek area suitable for developing. I tried to locate brownfield site on SMDC website but it shows many wordy documents but nothing is clearly stating where these sites lie. This could be my ineptitude but there could be more clarity for the lay person on these issues Building in such a large scale on The Mount would devalue housing already there. This may be viewed as a narrow minded but many people have worked hard and taken out huge loans to secure there desired homes. To effect there in such a drastic way I think is unfair and unnecessary. Most of the housing is currently at the higher end of the market and build social or low cost housing amongst his could be problematic from all prospective. If housing is built at the current level at these sites then who shall benefit those on low paid jobs, where I understand the most need is there are many units built as affordable part share homes unsold and many more privately owed sites of apartments etc. standing empty in Leek.	It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1731 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1554 about Anzio Camp • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3643	Mr and Mrs Jones				Object	We would like to formally submit our comment concerning the above consultation with specific regard to Leek East LE127, LE069, LE128, LE066, LE142a and LE142b. These consultations relate to Leek East and the area of Mount Road. This semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of its attractions of this area of Leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10 minutes' walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the Mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking, jogging and cycling. This is important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this, together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to nature very close to the heart of Leek. The combination of these two aspects make an early morning walk or late evening jog across Mount a uplifting and almost spiritual experience. The views from the Mount over Leek are spectacular and are largely unspoilt. Any development of the type and proposed would totally alter the character of the area, as it has with Buxton road end of the Mount. If all of the developments listed above were to proceed in excess of 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount Road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development, especially on the bad junction where Mount Road meets Ashbourne Rad, given the development has taken place from an old development that has already taken place on an old Quarry site and the proposed development on the other side of Ashbourne Road, near to the Poplar Service station, access via the already existing estate off either Kniveden Lane and or High View Rod and or Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature of roads in question are busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious safety consequences. Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land which would be ideal for the development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities, and would be more sustainable as they would not involve significant damage to the environment that would result from an increase of traffic outlying areas. Given the department from Leek of major employers such as the Britannia Building Society, a large proportion of these houses would inevitably be home for commuters from the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would totally ruin the character and community feeling of the area, and further issues in relation to the sustainable investment in local infrastructure. Planning conditions stating that the occupiers should have a connection with the local area have repeatedly been shown to be unenforceable in the contexts of the urban development. There have been applications	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE069. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO676 on design policies • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1766 about bus routes • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing It is standard practice for residential schemes which generate a requirement for 'local needs' affordable housing to have future occupation of those dwellings controlled via legal agreement linked to conditions upon the planning consent. Planning applications are assessed against the current Development Plan including the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy Policies.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						for planning permission relating to these areas before, most notably, in 2007. This was refused on appeal, given the strength of feeling within the local community against this development. Any temptation to alter the town development boundary to facilitate these proposals should be resisted as there is no proven case that the type or amount of development proposed is justifiable. Given in the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable houses in rural locations, more consideration should be given to this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of the town.	
PO472 6	Mr D And L Robinson				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a Central Government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself is the site allocated off Mount Road, Leek. At present most of the estates west of Mount Road are below the crest of the Mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of High View Road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along High View Road and Moorland Road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the Town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the Southern and Western flank of Leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the Mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	• See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1350 about streetlighting • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO11 about highways Note that vehicular access to LE127 is anticipated off Mount Road; SCC Highways response was predicated on this (not High View Road). The Council would assess residential schemes in proximity to approved wind turbines in accordance with Core Strategy and NPPF amenity Policies, and ETSU (as amended) noise criteria etc. • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response in PO702 about utilities and flood risk
PO472 2	Mr RP kerr						
PO473 5	Mr M Turnock						
PO473 1	Miss CM Hambleton						
PO474 1	Mr W Trafford						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4698	Mr And Mrs C and P Deighton				Object	We are writing to register our very deep concern about the proposal to build on the land at the Mount in Leek. Those involved in the making such decisions do not all live in Leek and probably unaware of the enormous importance of The Mount to the people living around it in Leek. The implications of losing this much loved countryside walk are very serious, and far reaching. The close proximity of The Mount to the homes of so many local people means that it is a place used regularly, often daily, for exercise and relaxation, and is vital to their health and mental well-being. A large number of local residents are elderly, and often unable to drive: there are young families who cannot afford a car: there are several care homes that residents come for walks with their careers. What make The Mount so important is that is so very close to people. It offers beautiful views across the fields and means that people, who cannot get out into the countryside further away, can still enjoy seeing the birds and animals here only just a small walk from where they live. People walking their dogs have a natural means of contact and conversation with others – so important especially for those who live alone. To sum up, we all be deeply distressed to lose this place. So many have been walking there all through their lives, the disruption, and seeing the gradual destruction of a cherished part of their lives will bring an increased sense of isolation, and the feeling of depression faced by those in their later years as they become less able to things without outside help. Having the ability to step outside and walk in open surroundings without having to ask for a lift means a lot to someone struggling to retain their independence and enjoyment for life. To build on The Mount is clearly not necessary. There are as we have all been made aware recently, many alterations for example: various Brown Field sites empty buildings such as factories and offices: disused mills, empty houses apparently unoccupied for long periods. In view of the very unpopular bad decisions made, and the continuing loss of trust in the judgement made and continuing loss of and motives, of the planning department many now suspect that the decisions are influenced mainly by financial incentives from Government or other sources. We do not know whether this is true, but it seems obvious to us that a prompt decision to abandon the idea of building The Mount would bring peace of mind to many Leek Residents and go a long way to restoring the publics belief that members of the Planning Department actually do care about, and will respond to, consider and respect the views, the well-being and even the happiness, of the town they responsible for looking after, both now and the future.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3937	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG			Object	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1] which states: The proposed urban extension to the east of the town...- LE127(100), LE128a(47), LE140(63), LE142a(140) and LE142b(40). The proposed extension also accommodates draft reserve sites LE069(42), LE128b(48) and LE066(50). These sites contribute a significant proportion of the proposed housing for Leek. The allocation of these sites, ahead of available brownfield/previously developed sites, is not in compliance Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy, which sets out the overarching strategy for development in Leek. ...None of the proposed allocations are considered likely to come forward in the short term based on the findings set out in the SHLAA (2015). However, we suggest that the allocation of sites which are deliverable within the short term should have been considered to a greater extent in formulating the preferred options due to the significant shortfall of housing delivery across the district. WYG consider that sites in Leek, such as LE243, are suitable to contribute to the short term delivery of housing in Staffordshire Moorlands. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the draft potential allocations weighs heavily on this eastern stretch of agricultural land and it is noted that no potential allocations have been selected within the core urban area.	Refer to Council response to PO3934 under LE127 table Question 10. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO4828	Mrs L Scragg				Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	- See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO11 on highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4707	Mr and Mrs A & N Waterhouse				Object	Building 400+ houses on the area known by everyone as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gate way to the countryside would be against everything that "localism" would bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and it's unrivalled and area as a whole acts as a buffer, between the town and the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra houses would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and junctions at either end of The Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work, use the Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield Road with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek Town Centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for houses thereby saving this precious area for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements
PO5886	Ms Linda M Beighton				Object	I am writing to object to the proposed plan to allocate the following sites along Mount Road for housing: LE127, LE128a, and LE142a. Mount Road is used by hundreds of people every day of the week as a safe, sustainable leisure route something the council should be encouraging not removing. The current road for much of its length I too narrow for 2 cars to pass. Development would cause urbanisation & widening with the potential destruction of mature trees and dry stone walls. Exits particularly onto Ashbourne Road are already problematic and would need expensive, major work to cope with the extra traffic. People occupying houses at the moment would in the main work on the western side of the town in Cheshire-Manchester and Stoke. Major supermarkets are in the western side of town. Daily trips would further exacerbate the congestion which already chokes Leek. So many houses would destroy what is designated a special landscape area. They would impact on the views from the Peak Park and destroy an amenity area. Extending the own boundary to accommodate the proposed sites is undesirable. Using green field's sites may be expected and enable larger profits for developers but there are still brown field sites and infill land available within the moorlands district.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1350 about tree protection • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1500 about special landscape area • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9144	Mr Ramon West				Object	We wish to object to the 4 preferred housing allocation sites on the Mount, Leek. It would be an outrage to proceed with residential development on any of these sites: LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a. The Council must take into consideration: Loss of local amenity - the Mount is a popular amenity enjoyed and cherished by walkers, joggers, cyclists, nature-lovers and dog-walkers. There is no comparable open countryside leisure amenity so close to the town centre. There is no comparable alternative within easy walking distance on the east side of town. Loss of such amenity would have an adverse effect on the health and wellbeing of a great many local people. Visual impact - the Mount is a classic example of outstanding moorland scenery. It provides unique and wonderful views over the town and beyond. Leek prides itself, and markets itself, as the Queen of the Moorlands. If this is to mean anything, the Council must do everything it can to halt the expansion of the town into the surrounding countryside and work to preserve the proximity and integrity of some of our finest moorlands scenery. Impact on infrastructure - hundreds of new houses will bring thousands of people. Nearby schools and GP surgeries will be put under further strain. Council services, social services and emergency services are already all under great strain. Traffic problems will be made worse. The future - the population of Leek is predicted to rise by a few thousand over the next couple of decades or so. This is mainly due to an ageing population. We are living longer. That means more of the people who are living here now will still be around in 20 or 30 years time. Therefore, planning for the future should be focused on local services for local people. We hope that the Council will heed our objections and explore alternative approaches to housing needs and development in our town. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to the 'Bimby Housing Toolkit' which was drawn up by the Prince's Foundation for Building Community (bimby.org.uk).	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note these assess the needs of 'older people' and other groups. The June 2014 SHMA concluded the number and proportion of older person households is expected to increase in the District over the period to 2031 (46% increase between 2011 and 2031) which has implications such as increased demand for both specialist/extra-care accommodation for older people, and for adaptable homes. Owing to an ageing population and other factors, the need for smaller units will in future exceed the need for larger, family units. For these reasons the SHMA recommends that 60% of future housing should be 1- or 2-bed. The Council's current Core Strategy Policies expect larger housing schemes to provide for a mix of housing across all locations, to respond to identified local needs such as housing for older people. Note that where there is a policy requirement for affordable housing provision upon such sites, the nature of provision may reflect the above. The BIMBY toolkit is noted. The Council will continue to work with communities seeking to introduce (or influence the preparation of) Neighbourhood Plans, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9105	Mr Robert McGuinness				Object	Email with representation form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sites LE127/LE128A/LE140/LE142A and 'School Site' [presumed LE140] alongside 2015 'Options' sites LE066/LE069/LE128B with the following text: Overdevelopment, traffic congestion issues, inadequate infrastructure, inadequate road network. Brownfield sites and redundant mills should be brought into use first.	• See para response to PO1702 about scale of development • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that site LE069 is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.
PO9090	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9065	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick				Object	I am writing to put forward my opposition to the building of houses on Mount Road in Leek. It upsets me greatly to think that an important local amenity could be lost forever if these proposals go ahead. "The Mount" as we fondly know it, is a valuable asset to the East side of Leek, a wonderful place to take our families for walks and bike rides. In our busy lives, it is vital for our health, both mental and physical to have somewhere to go to relax and unwind. What better place than a walk along the Mount with views over Bradnop and Morridge, so accessible from our homes. If the fields in the planning proposals-LE127, LE128, LE140 and most worryingly on the opposite side LE142 were to be built on then the landscape of our beautiful town will be lost forever. For those arriving in to Leek from Ashbourne Road, they would be met with yet another sprawling housing estate, replacing the picturesque fields full of animals that are so welcoming to see. The road will become a main thoroughfare from the Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road and will lose its charm for us all. Lets protect the gateway to LEEK for generations to come. SAVE THE MOUNT.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9060	Mr Terence Gee				Object	I wish to object to the proposal to build housing on sites LE127,LE128,LE140,LE142a on mount road. This is a green field site with a rural road with unspoilt views only five minutes walk from Pick wood avenue. This road is used regularly by myself and often meet other walkers, cyclists in the area. Also the road would have extra traffic for 500 houses with poor access. There would be increased pressure on local schools,doctors,etc and I feel it would spoil the area with increased urbanisation.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements
PO9073	Mr Stewart Johnson				Object	I am writing to protest against the proposed plans to build 4000 houses in the Leek area:- 1, question how many unoccupied properties are there in the area 2, Loss of beautiful countryside. 3, Work vacancies in the local area. 4, Local infrastructure . 5, Places at local schools. The list is just a few of the considerations the planners seem to be ignoring. Of particular concern is the proposed development along Mount Road. Not only would this destroy a beautiful part of the town used by many residents,it would also cause serious traffic problems both in the immediate vicinity and the rest of the town. These new residents would have to commute,and the main routes would be right through the centre of town adding to an already serious congestion problem. Why do the planners want to destroy the treasure that is The Queen of the Moorlands!	• See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways
PO9081	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9096	Ms Sarah Bishop				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands" , Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"! As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land, before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken in to deep consideration before this gem in the town is lost forever.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9315	Ms Emily Hodgkinson						
PO9407	Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9119	Mr Robert Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. It is also important to note that TOURISM is a significant driver to the local Economy! Therefore the Town Gateway, especially from the PEAK PARK Buxton Road A53, needs rigorous protection from urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of The Moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive and picturesque and is a key Tourist route. It is also a highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who very regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thorncliffe Road and its' adjoining lanes, and The Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horseriding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicing, and general enjoyment for health and wellbeing. The proposal area, particularly as it approaches the A53 Buxton Road junction with Thorncliffe Road and The Mount, is immediately adjacent to the SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its Historic Landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority in its protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is 'Special' in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There are a number of 'brown' sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. [Question why] these are not shown on the accompanying Consultation Maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be "The Preferred Option Housing Sites" in the view of the residents of Leek. There are also pockets of greenbelt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no other particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other Towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitivity to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the Town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road is a Major Intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc.. It would put a major strain onto the area and have significantly adverse effects on the locality. The proposal is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the "housing requirement"[queries this as unjustified] along 1 narrow lane at the most Flagship side of Leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the "brown sites" and protect Leek's Heritage and inheritance!	• See para response to PO11 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO676 about design policies Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1500 about special landscape area • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO193 about heritage impact considerations • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9133	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed. Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek in this issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO939 2	Mr Chris Taylor				Object	Land ref LE142a: Development of this land should be resisted. It would block panoramic views from Mount Road towards the Peak Park, and specifically the Roaches. It would have the greatest negative impact on the character and amenity of the Mount Road, a widely appreciated natural environment much loved by many people from the Town who enjoy this leisure walk on a frequent basis.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO676 about design policies • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access
PO919 6	Mrs M Motum				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO11 about highways
PO924 7 PO920 1	Mr John Belfield Mrs Maureen Belfield				Object	The rural fringe of Leek, and specifically Mount Road, would become urbanised. The Mount is a very popular route for leisure activities and exercise for many people and this would be lost. With the enormous number of proposed new houses there would be a massive increase in the amount of traffic both on the mount and also in the surrounding area. Kniveden Lane is already a busy road as it gives access to the small car park at the Moorlands Hospital. This car park is already insufficient for the needs of the hospital and many cars currently park on Kniveden Lane. If hundreds of houses are built on the mount Kniveden Lane would become a significant means of access to Ashbourne Road. The road network would need to be considerably enhanced and part of Kniveden Lane would need to be properly surfaced. This would lead to a major change in traffic patterns in the area which would lead to a loss of public amenity. This would not only cause traffic chaos but would also pollute the surrounding area. It would also make the smaller residential streets of Pitcher Lane and Trafford Close a potential car park for those who currently use Kniveden Lane for this purpose. There are brownfield sites available for building and also more suitable greenfield sites, for example Foker Grange and Home Farm, which have much easier access to the main road network. I therefore object to the building plans on the Mount which are numbered LE142a LE140, LE128a and LE127.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO92 about air quality The Council maintains a database of housing site suggestions (SHLAA). This database formed the basis of the 2015 'Site Options' consultation as all SHLAA sites above a minimum size threshold, and attracting a 'B' deliverability rating, were included in that consultation. Subsequently 2016 'Preferred Options' were narrowed down from this. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9339	Mr Derek Kay				Object	Herewith are my objections yet again about building proposals affecting open greenbelt land on Mount Road. I strongly object to delinations LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, on the grounds of unnecessary and deleterious incursion into valuable scenic amenities. The fringes of this town (Queen of the Moorlands) must be preserved at all costs. Open aspects across towards the Peak District are essential for our spiritual wellbeing; unwelcome development of additional traffic flow and population density would be the corollary of this building project, were it to succeed. Conversely, there is much brownfield potential within the town boundary itself; rundown old mills for example (which may be protected by outdated listing orders) and other unsightly structures causing blots on the "townscape". Not enough positive action to clean up the interior of this town has been taken over the years. Use compulsory purchase orders where difficult site owners will not cooperate and make the Queen worthy of her name.	• See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Whilst Councils do retain CPO powers in principle, these are generally used (if at all) as a last resort where it is expedient and in the public interest for the Council to do so, where agreement with landowners is not possible. As explained in response to PO91 the Council makes assumptions that development schemes will come forward within the Leek development boundary to contribute to its housing need to 2031, which could include historic premises etc. Applications affecting listed or non-listed "heritage assets" would be assessed against Section 12 NPPF and Council Policies. The Council would also assess schemes in the town centre against the aspirations of the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9302	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9239	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water Im concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO92 about air quality • See para response to PO682 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response in PO702 about utilities and flood risk The Council must demonstrate to planning inspector that its Local Plan is based on the principles of sustainable development. The NPPF is clear that this means three roles – economic, social, and environmental, and that they are considered simultaneously. The Council's submitted Policies and objectives would therefore have to satisfy this. • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	
PO9182	Mrs E Adams				Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways
PO9253	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1350 about streetlighting

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	
PO9296	Mrs Gwen Gledhill				Object	Re sites LE127,128,140.142a I wish to object strongly to the proposal to make these sites on The Mount available for housing on the following grounds: 1. Traffic The Mount is a narrow country lane with no pavements and little or no street lighting. There are narrow and dangerous junctions at both ends on to the Buxton and Ashbourne roads and a dangerous bend by LE127. The traffic generated by the proposed 400 houses will completely overload these junctions at busy times and generate a major risk to pedestrians on the lane itself, especially as there is not sufficient width for two cars to pass each other for most of the length of the lane. Commuters travelling from these house to Manchester, Macclesfield or Stoke will only add to the town centre traffic congestion at busy times. 2. The Local Housing Need It is well documented that the local need is for starter homes for young people and 'downsizing' homes for older people. These are not required on the edge of town but need to be closer to the centre where there are shops, amenities and better public transport links. Whatever developers initially propose re 'affordable housing' on The Mount, the reality is that they will ultimately build executive homes attractive to commuters travelling to Manchester, Stoke and beyond at prices cheaper than can be found in Cheshire East! I believe that the buyers will not be local people and thus the developments will not answer the local housing need. There are other sites that could address this need to the south and north west of the town and via infill in the centre itself. Planners should look more carefully at these and not settle quickly for 'easier' options. 3 Our Environment The Mount is a long standing area of natural beauty, accessible to most town residents on foot with views equal to those enjoyed across the Peak District. The developments will ruin this aspect and destroy a major, free, leisure experience for local people right on the edge of The Peak District National Park - their officers will (I'm sure) be objecting too!	• See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO9144 about ageing District population • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9166	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this. Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO92 about air quality • See para response to PO1350 about tree protection • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142A in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9272	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as "Preferred Housing Allocation". There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners. 5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response in PO702 about utilities and flood risk • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9215	Mrs Adams E				Object	I wish to place my strong objections to the proposals to build house on the mount, leek. It would devastate this beautiful area which benefits tourists and residents alike. Objections also relate to roads, schools, doctors etc. Please please rethink your plans.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO676 about design policies • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements
PO9189	Ms Michele Rushton				Object	I wish to register my disapproval re the above development and quite the following points. Loss of an important local amenity – the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by people across the town. Visual impact - restricting important and highly valued panoramic views across the Leek skyline and further afield. Impact on infrastructure - primary schools in particular (East Street, Beresford) will struggle to keep up with demand and the situation where some children already have to travel to schools in the west of Leek will become more and more common Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging High quality landscape – unsympathetic to the landscape character and quality of the area Urbanisation of the country lane that is Mount Road – if all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The spatial distribution of proposed sites across Leek is unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event The volume and speed of traffic is likely to increase on Kniveden Lane where my family have been residents for over 25years. Please for the sake of Leek and her people, review your proposal. Question where are the jobs to support people buying new houses Traffic & congestion through & around Leek is already critical without the addition of more vehicles. Question why can't brownfield sites/old mills etc be converted to housing · I chose to live near Mount Road because I like it as it is, please do not change it!	• See para response to PO91 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO91 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO675 about educational requirements • See para response to PO680 about public rights of way • See para response to PO90 about highways • See para response to PO1683 about viability study • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							windfall allowance
PO9207	Mr Martin Bagshaw				Object	I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development on the mount area of Leek. I have lived in Leek for all of my life and I and many others , have spent many happy hours enjoying the scenery and tranquility that this area of the town offers to residents of the town. To develop in this area will drastically reduce the local amenity for the residents of the town. It is a lovely picturesque area that is within easy reach of the town centre. And I believe that to destroy it would be an absolute travesty. The area has many amenity uses, such as walking, horse riding, cycling and jogging, let alone just sitting on the benches and chilling. I think the existing schools will struggle to cope with the increased demand for places. The increase the traffic on the roads surrounding the mount will be significant, and traffic calming measures will need to be considered for safety reasons and quality of life of the existing residents in the area. There also be an increase in commuter traffic from this development. I think the majority of which will have to cross the town towards either Stoke on Trent or Cheshire. This will add to the already considerable traffic issues in the town. I believe the Barnfields, the rear of Sainsbury and Foker Grange Farm would be much better locations, so that the increase in traffic is kept away from the town centre. It was my understanding the houses were proposed for the rear of Sainsbury's. But I understand this has hit commercial difficulties with residual contamination.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. • See para response to PO1731 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9175	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	• See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P0119 on housing needs evidence The NPPF expects Councils to meet objectively assessed development requirements, and also encourages brownfield development, subject to wider Policies. • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9221	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	- See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO11 about highways - See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access
PO9289	Mr Ian Harrison				Object	I hereby which to object to the building of houses etc on The Mount, Leek. This road, used by many is the last place to admire the scenic views of both Leek and the surrounding areas. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. If one site is given permission for house building, then all others will follow and question where will it end. There must be countless brown field sites in the leek area which can be built on first and foremost. If 500 houses were to be built, what happens to Leek. The jobs aren't there, infrastructure, the existing roads can't cope with todays traffic (constant gridlocks in the town centre, never mind 1000 further cars. No hope of a ring road around leek. Junior schools, can't cope with further numbers of school pupils. My wife and I continue to walk over the mount and admire the scenery, as well as the many more who walk, cycle, run and horse ride over it. The new housing would block the outstanding views people go the the mount to view.	- See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. - See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO11 about highways - See para response to PO676 about educational requirements - See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9282	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	• See para response to PO676 about design policies • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement
PO9309	Councillor Gail Lockett				General comment	LE142a – is owned by [a local charity] and I believe they are against the development.	The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9324	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots IE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example, the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance, for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country " walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built. There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important, local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO676 about design policies The emerging Local Plan is not yet finalised and needs to undergo independent public examination by Government appointed Planning Inspector before it can become adopted. Planning applications arising before this happens must be determined against the NPPF and current Council planning policies. • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9332	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is an quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about air quality
PO9350	Mr David Rowe				Object	I am writing to object to the selection of all sites on Mount Road, LE127, LE128, LE140 and LE142a. This road is of great value to local people as a very accessible place to experience and benefit from the surrounding countryside. Many people walk, cycle, exercise their dogs along this road every day, and this would be completely lost if development was allowed to take place. There are several brownfield sites in the town that should be considered instead, e.g. the old mills, Barnfields site.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO9207 about existing industrial areas

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9387	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park. The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	- See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO11 about highways - See para response to PO1142 about affordable housing - See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt - See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. - See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9426	Mr Michael Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs, these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!! There are loads of other areas in Leek that are within the boundaries of leek and not on green field sites (Huge's Concrete site for one) Leek dose not need this amount of housing there is not the work/jobs for the increase in people. This is all about money in the pocket for the council. If we need another primary school increase extend Beresford Memorial school there is about 3 acres of fields behind the school.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO9207 about existing industrial areas • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO676 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO676 about Leek education requirements
PO9380	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west side of Leek are developable.	• See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Plan. The map in the Preferred Options consultation document is intended to illustrate proposed allocations and development boundaries and other summary information, not the extent of land ownerships. • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO193 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO1142 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO682 about Leek employment land requirements The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence.
PO9372	Councillor Rebecca Done				Object	On the proposed planning for the Mount in Leek..I do not agree with and my reasons are stated below: The Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by a lot of people across the town including myself. There will be a massive impact on infrastructure, I think primary schools in particular would suffer (East Street, Beresford) and will struggle to keep up with demand. Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging. If all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The proposed sites across Leek are unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO676 about educational requirements • See para response to PO682 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO11 about public rights of way • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO1683 about viability study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9398	Ms Katie Giddings				Object	I wish to register my strong objection to the sites identified for development along The Mount, Leek. The site reference numbers are LE127, LE128, LE140 & LE142a. The Mount is highly valued by the people of Leek. Hundreds of people use it every day & enjoy the landscape and views. These people cover a broad mix - there are walkers & strollers, hikers & joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists - and they range through all ages, from young to old. Generations have taken the air along The Mount and future generations deserve the same opportunity. Chance and regular encounters with this variety of people whose paths would probably otherwise not cross creates the sense of community so often lacking elsewhere but celebrated in Leek. The view of Leek from The Mount creates a sense of belonging to and connection with the whole town, enhancing this sense of belonging. I may not live the other side of Leek but I can see it every time I walk the Mount and feel part of its whole. The town is visible from The Mount & I can enjoy the view of its special architecture & character. This natural landscape is free for everyone to enjoy and is accessible within minutes of the town centre. It is a landscape and community which would be lost forever should the developments go ahead. Such things are irreplaceable and I despair that The Mount is even being considered as a suitable option. I am a recent newcomer to Leek having moved here three years ago. I have never lived anywhere more welcoming and cheerful and full of people appreciating and making the most of living in such a beautiful place. The Mount is at present a country lane offering peace and tranquil exercise. Its urbanisation would completely change its character and make it a main road connecting Ashbourne & Buxton Roads. The traffic increase would be beyond that contributed to by extra housing as it would become a highly attractive route for those seeking to avoid Leek town centre. The access to and from Ashbourne Road would also radically change the character of that end of town. The increased housing would alter the balance of the town and there is simply not that level of demand for housing in that area. The figures of required housing also appear to be based on doubtful statistics so that the very need for this level of housing in the Moorlands is questionable. It would really be dreadful if this so very important natural landscape were to disappear forever from Leek. In conversation with the people I meet along the Mount, there is a strong feeling of being threatened by changes beyond their control & of losing something very precious. Many people have said they have no faith that their feelings and needs will be valued. Please change their minds and show that local people will be listened to and their objections acted upon. Please don't build on The Mount.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO119 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO11 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142A in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9414	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	• See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO92 about air quality
PO9431	Ms Catherine Harvey				Object	To whom this may concern. I would like to raise my strongest objections to the proposed plans to build across the mount - LE142A, LE140, LE128 & LE127. This is a beautiful and precious area for the people of Leek who currently enjoy leisure activities such as walking etc which is easily accessed by many, both old and young. The fantastic views of this high quality landscape and the therapeutic benefits it offers are easily available to all who want to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the countryside without having to travel far from their doorstep, and who may not be in a position to! To lose this lovely countryside would be a tragic and very sad loss to the people of Leek. The Mount is a narrow county lane and is totally unsuitable for increasing the flow of traffic. Having Buxton Road at one end of The Mount and Ashbourne Road at the other, this would create a massive increase in the volume of traffic using it, and increase the risk of accidents - it's totally unsuitable! In addition to this, the increase in homes would ruin what is currently a peaceful retreat and a habitat for our wildlife which I have seen loads of rare birds when walking our dogs , these birds would go away and would not be seen again. Also foxes and badgers. Concern that fatal traffic accidents will occur. Leave our mount and all it has to offer well alone!!	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO11 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO11 about highways • See para response to PO682 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO11 on highways • See para response to PO11 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement • See para response to PO221 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO120	Mrs Alison Campion				Object	Extra housing will create more traffic on already busy narrow road. Views and open spaces should be left as they are for the public to enjoy when walking and cycling.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022 /LE127 /LE128 /LE140 /LE142A /LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded site LE142B to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visible from the Peak Park and could affect its setting; and could also affect the rural approach to Leek from the Peak Park. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's emerging Local Plan policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO230	Miss Alicia Guy				Object	Building nearly 400 houses in the Mount area will totally ruin the lovely breathtaking scenery and peace and quiet that you get up there, increased traffic will spoil the area also. It could bring house prices down as at the moment it is such a lovely peaceful area and this no doubt will change	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways • Property values are not considered material in planning law.
PO235	Mr Daniel Frith						
PO93	Mr Bill Reid				Object	This area is a most popular area for walkers, runners, drivers and strollers. It has been, for as long as I can remember, an area that provides views over Leek town and the surrounding area which cannot be equalled. It is a beautiful peaceful part of Leek which should not be spoilt by housing estates and the disruption that goes with it. The top of Kniveden Lane has a piece of unadopted road which deters motorists from using it as a thoroughfare and I am sure that this would become adopted if the proposed plans go ahead causing untold traffic, noise and pollution, as well as the dangers to residents from the traffic. There are many areas around Leek which would be far more suitable.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers control of all forms of pollution arising from development. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142B in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral "urban extensions" around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence inprogressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO223	Mr Andrew Bodiam				Object	Like many others I have enjoyed walking on the Mount for 12 years and the planned housing site allocations in this area will completely destroy one of Leek's most valuable assets. Just take a walk along Mount Road and imagine what it would be like with the planned housing in place. I appreciate the Governments requirements but I am far from convinced that Leek's rural countryside should be sacrificed to their cause when there are so many brown field sites available. Furthermore, Leek is not a commuter town and I wonder if there is really the demand for 600 houses especially when those that are for sale take forever to do so. I would therefore ask you to think again.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken into account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO683	Andy McGraw					Extension of the Town Boundary into the Natural Zone The following blocks identified as, potentially suitable housing sites, all appear to be outside the town boundary on the maps supplied by the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, on this second housing consultation June 2016 Block numbers; LE 127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a, LE142b All the above mentioned blocks are therefore proposed to be constructed on the Natural Zone land surrounding the town of Leek. Public Amenity The small narrow lane known as Mount Road which travels between the A53 Leek/ Buxton road and A523 Leek/ Ashbourne road along which the following blocks appear, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a, are used on a daily basis as a public amenity. The lane is constantly used by locals and visitors to walk, ride and enjoy the views in relative safety at present. If the proposed housing goes ahead, with the number of houses planned on these sites, this road will undoubtedly suffer a dramatic increase in the number of vehicles using it, by averaging 2 cars per household, thus reducing its safety and relative quiet enjoyment. The views over the town of Leek and its surrounding countryside will also be affected detrimentally. I also note that the lane is included as part of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks, advertised and mapped by the Ordnance Survey as a recreational path but not highlighted as such on the SMDC consultation map. Surely the increase in vehicular traffic would compromise this route. Other public rights of way, public footpaths, are either not shown or seem now to stop at the new	Note that there is not a 'natural zone' designation for open countryside in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The consultation map is intended to depict summary information only; it does not for example illustrate public rights of way.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						development. When I raised the question of this fact at consultation the officer was unable to answer my query. In these times of austerity and the constant cut backs to local government, areas of free enjoyment and recreational use which also merit health benefits need to be conserved. Wildlife Concerns The blocks shown as, LE127, LE128a, LE140 and LE142a are frequently used by several bird species, especially during the winter months, as important feeding grounds. Some of these bird species are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CA81) as Schedule 1 protected species, identified by BirdLife International as Globally Threatened species and are listed as Red List species of birds of conservation concern by organisations, the RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), the British Ornithologists Union, Natural England and the British Trust of Ornithology, to name a few. The birds in question are; Fieldfare Turdus pilaris, Schedule 1 W&CA 81 and Red List species Redwing Turdus iliacus, Schedule 1 W&CA81 and Red List Species Starling Sturnus vulgaris, Red List species The small block of land between blocks LE127 and LE128a is also important to wildlife in particular bird species. Although this land is not earmarked for development I feel that the disturbance of the development would compromise the species using it. This small wooded block is used during the winter months as an important winter roost for a small number of Raven Corus corax, a species again afforded a certain amount of protection. Species using this block to breed include, Little Owl Athene noctua, although not afforded any specific protection via acts of Parliament or listed as a concern yet, it is a species showing major decline, UK population estimated to be down by 24%, as highlighted by the RSPB breeding bird data 1995 – 2008. Great Spotted Woodpecker Dendrocopos major, Nuthatch Sitta europaea, are other examples of regular breeding species in this area. Due to disturbance I predict that many of these species will refrain from using this important area. Infrastructure As mentioned previously the numbers of new houses proposed in the areas of Mount Road and Thornccliffe Road, blocks LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, will put an enormous strain on the local infrastructure and road system. We all constantly experience the difficulties whilst travelling through the town of Leek caused by any one road closure. Both junctions from Mount Road can be difficult to negotiate now with the small amount of traffic using it with the A523 being particularly dangerous in its present form. Problems with access at both these junctions will be severely increased with the increased volume of traffic. At the original consultation July 2015 there was no mention of increasing employment opportunities even when the question was raised. I still feel that these concerns have yet to be addressed. It was implied but not	The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2017 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						confirmed that most of the individuals who would be residing in the new development would be commuter based, travelling to nearby cities to seek their employment. This surely is contrary to most local government policies that are tasked with reducing this activity to contribute towards climate change and global warming issues. These planned developments will also have a visual, probably a negative impact from the adjoining Peak District National Park as it will be observed from the iconic Roaches and the boundary road of Morridge. There seems to be little or no mention of the use of brown field sites throughout the proposal. With the relaxation of planning rules for developing these sites should the Council look to these sites first. Removing deteriorating buildings and areas within the town that look unsightly and replacing with new developments would surely enhance the town, and, as they are close to amenities within the town centre, reduce the need for occupants to use their motor vehicles on shopping trips or evening entertainment. There are also a number of old mills and factories within the existing town boundary that could and should be transformed and upgraded into apartment blocks, as they have in other towns and cities in the UK, which would save those buildings from further degradation, provide perfect housing within	the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the town and help to keep the overall feel of the town and its history. Conclusion In conclusion it is my belief that the proposed development and size of that development will have a serious and negative impact on the market town of Leek and its Natural Zone boundary. As a society in general we are losing touch with nature and the great outdoors. There are Government initiatives to reverse and combat this trend. Organisations, funded by the National Lottery, Government, County and Local councils including SMDC, are tasked to promote these initiatives assisting people to re-engage with nature. We are also constantly reminded these days of health, well-being and mental health issues that our society is increasingly subject too due to the pressures of our modern living and the need for places for people to unwind. With this in mind how can we justify increasing the urban zone into our countryside. We have a duty to protect iconic landscapes, open spaces and the biodiversity such as can be found within the Mount Road area for the future generations of this fantastic town, so that they too, can experience quiet and peaceful recreation as we have enjoyed over the years. Maybe the Officers involved in making the final decisions should take an early morning walk along the Mount Road to experience these quiet and peaceful surroundings with the only noise being provided by the local bird-life with their dawn chorus. Once we lose these areas they are lost forever.	In relation to comments on economic impact, new housing has a proven positive economic benefit to an area, generated both by expenditure of construction industry and through longer term residential spend.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO677	Mr Jonathan Hulme				Object	The mount is an important, free, extensively used recreation facility for Leek. The proximity of the mount to the town makes it easily accessible, providing a rural escape for walkers, cyclists, joggers and families alike. This invaluable resource contributes to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all who use it. The mount provides panoramic views of the town and surrounding moor land including the Roches, and housing developments should not encroach on this. The junctions with the A53 and the A523 are also quite dangerous and unsuited to large amounts of traffic. Some form of traffic management would need to be added to these junctions, increasing congestion in and around the town to even higher levels than currently (which is already too high!!). This deters visitors to the town, reducing the amount of tourist trade. The area is also important ecologically and accommodates a variety of species, some of which appear on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. This excessive allocation of sites appears to be national policy implemented at a local level without consideration of local needs and demographics. The infrastructure in the east of the town is insufficient to cope with a population influx. For instance, the schools and health facilities are already full. Housing development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in the town such as Davenport mill on Mill Street and the mill on Ashbourne Road. The developers who own these sites should be incentivised to commence development. Redevelop eyesores, don't diminish beauty spots.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO703	Mr John Burnett				Object	This existing field forms an intrinsic part of the open space known as the Mount. As such it provides views over the town out to the Macclesfield area and for users of the Mount affords an area of outstanding natural beauty. Building on this plot of land would severely restrict the views available and would mean that use of the Mount Road as an exercise and recreation facility would be severely restricted. I would also object based on my concerns that building in this location would have severe impact on both existing infrastructure including roads and schools and would affect the ground water run off causing issues in other areas of the town. Building on this land would demonstrably damage the aspirations of the local community and would have severe economic and environmental consequences - completely at odds with the objectives of the consultation.	- See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence None of the Mount sites attract an AONB designation. - See para response to PO120 on highways - See para response to PO677 about educational requirements The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to any of the Mount sites. The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that subsequent development proposals would be required to integrate sustainable drainage features into layouts, as required by the Flood and Water Management Act. - See para response to PO683 about economic benefits of housebuilding
PO1321	Mr Stapleton	Leek And District Civic Society			Object	I write on behalf of Leek & District Civic Society to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision to include The Mount' Leek as a preferred option for housing development. This area is heavily used by recreational walkers and is the sort of local amenity which would be absolutely spoilt by additional building. Leek has few enough open spaces as it is and the loss of The Mount would be completely unjustifiable. Of all the site options in the Leek area, The Mount is the one which we feel should be absolutely sacrosanct and protected for the present populace and future generations.	See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1349	Mr A Birks				Object	This morning whilst taking my constitutional stroll around mount road I happened upon a group of people considering the best plots to build houses in this beauty spot. One member of the group introduced herself as a local councillor. My heart sank as it became clear that some minds at least, against the wishes of the local people, the decision to build seems to have been taken. It is outrageous that the local community is once again to be ignored by those elected to serve us. Mount Road is a very important part of the social scene of Leek as local people use it daily to enjoy the countryside which is within their homes. It would be an ecological and social outrage to remove this facility from the people of Leek. This area is more important to the wellbeing of residents from across the town than any other area around Leek as it is their gateway to a relaxed walk in the fresh air in the countryside. Any development of this area would change the nature of Leek as it would necessitate the widening of the road, the installation of lighting and the uprooting of that special commodity trees. The Mount Road would be a major thoroughfare between the Ashbourne Road, and Buxton Road, Kniveden Lane. Would be a conduit between the same roads meaning heavy traffic rushing through the estate and there would be a problems caused by necessary construction of major road junctions at each end of the Mount Road. Local residents this would be a disaster. There is a concern too that, with the addition of a large number of houses in this area, the infrastructure at this end of town would be challenged beyond its ability to cope. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very full and recent queues of vehicles to get into town were horrendous during the roadworks in the town. Imagine the chaos should we add another 500 families in the queue. In the unlikely event that Leek should actually need extra accommodation, consideration should be given to brownfields or less intrusive sites first. There are several derelict mills which could be utilised for apartments or demolished for housing. The infrastructure of drains, electricity and gas is readily available near these 2 areas too. I appeal to the council to reflect on the wishes of those who elected them to serve their needs and reject the idea of developing this area and retain it for enjoyment and health of the many people of Leek who appreciate it.	The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. The Council would as far as possible seek the retention of, or replacement of trees against its Core Strategy NE1 Policy where a scheme proposes tree loss. • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1140	Mr R Harrison				Object	I have recently looked at the site plans and talked to one of your officers concerning the location: This is a narrow road, used by many recreational purposes such as walking, cycling The views over Leek Conservation area and its surrounding area are 2nd to none both night and day There have been lots of houses built on the east side of Leek in recent years mainly off Ashbourne road. As the majority of people travel to Macclesfield, Manchester and Stoke on Trent to work, this means they have to travel through the centre and often Leek is gridlocked at busy times The exits from the Mount onto Buxton and the Ashbourne Roads are both very narrow and difficult to negotiate. Schools at the end of the town are already full to capacity and young children have to be taken across Leek early in the morning and collected in the evening. Drs Lists are so full. We are told that some of these houses are possible affordable housing. What does this mean? There are plenty of small terrace houses on the market which I would consider as affordable. So do we need more? In fact do we need a 1000 new houses to be in Leek at all anywhere? If so I would like to think that there are possible sites in Leek - West End could be given consideration before further action is taken. Leek is a beautiful small town with easy access to countryside. By allowing building on The Mount Road that access will be diminished as more of our green fields turned into housing developments and country roads become clogged with vehicles. Where will it end?	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements The Council consults with its Housing Officer when setting definitions of 'affordable' in relation to affordable housing. This usually equates to a percentage of open market value which represents the upper limit that the house can be sold/resold for. An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing. • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142B in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO988	Mr Chris Clark				Object	In conjunction with my comments on allocation LE142A, this site is totally unsuitable. It is on a hill-top overlooking the town and surrounding countryside, and housing in this location will destroy the rural nature of the area. This site is way outside the current town boundary, and there are many alternative sites (including current "brown-field" areas) that are far more suitable for housing development.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1575 PO1571 PO1576	Mrs S Chauveau Mrs S Chauveau Mr PJ Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount. It is a beautiful spot, Leek's gateway into the open country side and has been popular with walkers, joggers, cyclist and horse riding for generations and should be protected for future generations. I strongly recommend further consideration be given to the developing the empty mills, brownfield Sites and making use of the many vacant homes in the Moorlands before surrendering our precious Greenfields to hungry developers	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1684	Mr N A Brundrett				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocation plan for the SMDC. The site references of particular interest are: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. The grounds for that are:	
PO1678	MRS A Staton					Loss of important local amenity – The Mount is a very important open space close to the town.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1654	Mrs G Webster					Visual impact – restrict important skyline and further afield. The proposed sites are near or run on particularly at night with street lighting.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1349 about streetlighting
PO1639	Mr B Day					Impact for infrastructure – primary schools in particular (Leek 1 st school and Beresford Memorial School) will struggle to keep up demand and the situation where some children already have to school in the west of leek will become more common. Mount Road is a route of Staffordshire Moorlands Walk a very popular route for Leisure activities such as running, cycling and walking.	• See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way
PO1648	Mrs J Lownds					High quality Landscape – unsympathetic to landscape and the character and quality of the area. Urbanisation of the country lane that is mount road – if all 6 developments proceed then the 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would be linking the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads. The spatial distribution of the proposed access sites across leek is unbalance – there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of the town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event. The Mount is, and has been a great source of pleasure for many people over years. It needs to stay that way in order that the future generations have as much enjoyment out of this as our generation has.	• See para response to PO677 about design policies • See para response to PO120 about highways The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
PO1665	Mr S Panek						
PO1660	Mr A Panek						
P O4771	Miss J Panek						
PO4759	Mrs A Lomas						
PO4752	Mr & Mrs P & J Whitehurst						
	Miss L Whitehurst						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1685	Mr David Morgan				Object	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to build houses on the Mount. I specifically object to the building off houses on sites: LE022, LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. When I first heard about the proposal to build in this area. I was genuinely shocked and still cannot believe that the proposal have been submitted to build on such beautiful landscape which has helped to shape Leek's identity as Queen Of the moorlands. I work in the local community and I have not heard a single resident of Leek express support for these proposals – they have expressed deep anger and concern. I live locally to the Mount and regularly take walks there and it is very clearly, a popular destination for walkers and cyclist. However, I do not feel that this is area that is solely of Leek by these who live in its vicinity. I believe that the mount is an area that the people of Leek genuinely cherish and it would be a tragedy if a major housing development were built along it, The Mount does provide an important amenity for local residents including Hargate estate. I feel it would be unacceptable to build houses on it, spoiling the unspoilt beauty of the area and leading to a huge increase in the traffic which would obviously cause a major hazard to walkers and cyclist. I feel it is unacceptable to deprive residents of a very built up area such as Haregate estate of the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful country side and open space this that the mount offers. If this proposal is passed then I feel that the character and identity of Leek will be very adversely affected and this will have a very detrimental impact on its image in terms of visitors and attracting business	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about economic benefits of housebuilding • See para response to PO677 on design policies

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1281	Mrs B Ward				Object	I write once again to protest against the proposed development of housing along and off mount road. We have already had 2 public enquires and each time the inspector has upheld the decision not to allow these fields to develop along mount road. This is a great amenity for the town, especially for residents this side of leek. I feel that we have been left a short stretch off mount road but with all the roads going off it Mount Road itself will probably have to be widened and will become a bi pass for traffic between Buxton Road. Walking along a country lane enjoying the views. Do people walk as much on the other side of town? Aren't there still places for the development within the town? Not touching our open spaces. Where are 600 new houses on Mount Road going to work?	The Council must justify proposed land allocations which form part of its new Local Plan to planning inspector during public examination of the Local Plan. The Inspector must consider the 'soundness' of the Plan as per para 182 NPPF. Note that as part of this process the Council must demonstrate that it meets its objectively assessed development requirements for housing (and other land uses) for the District. • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements
PO1471	Mrs G Armstrong				Object	As a resident of Moorland Road since 1975, I write to you to express my concerns over the appalling plan to yet again to destroy an area of the town much loved and frequented by its residents for countless generations. I can assure you that the contents of the letter not only reflect the views of me and the residents of moorland road and Kniveden Lane but those of leek in general. The proposal to build 400 houses on the Mount came as a shock to the town. Whilst I am not opposed to the idea of providing some housing In the Leek area, I cannot equate with the requirement for the number your department are planning. As regards the location, how can you say that a beautiful location like the Mount is in need of development when there are numerous locations that in the area that are an eyesore and would be more than fit the bill for re development? If your department were to take the time too canvas the people of leek you would find that it is considered an asset to this town. The Mount is an area of outstanding rural beauty with great views across the town, supporting an abundance of wildlife whose habitat would be destroyed if the plan goes ahead. It has long been a source of relaxation, leisure, exercise, and even welcomes retreats for courting couples and families with children or people exercising their pets can be seen walking the Mount in complete safety without the fear of being subjected to danger from large numbers of cars. This would change if the whole scheme goes ahead. Is it right that future generations should be denied the pleasure their forebears derived from this beautiful road, With an average of	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						each household owning 2 cars each the pain to build 400 residents could unleash about 800 vehicles all trying to support those numbers. Mount road would be saturated with vehicles all trying to leave either via the junction with the A523 Ashbourne Road or the A53 Buxton Road. Both roads are very busy main roads. After frustration of accessing these knock on effect would choke the town centre which struggles now at certain times to maintain a smooth flow. No doubt the un adapted and unmade section of Kniveden Lane would be upgraded encouraging it to be used as a short cut between Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road. The only thing that stops it being a rat track now is that it is unmade and has ruts and pot holes. Also of concern is that with this sort of development you re require to provide a proportion for social housing. We all know who are housed in these and what effect it has on the surrounding area. I need say no more. Can you explain why there seems determination within the planning bodies to destroy what is beautiful and precious to the people of Leek with total disregard to the preservation of the environment and wishes of the Leek populace. If they want to improve this town why don't they concentrate on some off those areas in dire need of redevelopment and of which there are many in this town. I along with the majority of the other house owners in the vicinity, share at the lack of the thought the has obviously not being thought that has gone into this project. I ask the question; have any of the councillors or those on the planning dep actually bothered to walk to location, to see for themselves what they would be destroying and ask residents for their thoughts. No, I doubt it very much if this is the case.is it just a figure on the map to them? I understand that the majority are not from leek and so don't really have its best interests at heart. These so called councillors were voted in to represent the towns folk and listen to their view. This has not obviously been thought out thoroughly and it makes me wonder what sort of people will be running the council. Is it yet again something to their advantage and not that of the town. Their priorities do not appear to be the people of leek there to represent them. I make this representation not only on behalf of those directly affected but also the people of leek who are totally opposed to this desecration of one of the most beautiful and well-loved areas.	
PO1501 PO9120	MRS KAREN BARKER Mr Robert Barker				Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the town boundary into farmland as there are still many available brownfield sites within the locality. There is much greater need for jobs/employment as priority in the town if people are to be enticed to come to live here by large scale housing developments. There are presently not enough jobs locally to adequately provide for the current housing occupants. There is likely to be an increased need for Housing Benefits affecting the local economy together with significant increased pressure on infrastructure due to need for travel in and out of the area for work. It is also important to note tourism is a significant driver to the local economy! Therefore the town gateway, especially from the Peak Park	• See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO677 about design policies Green Belt is a long established designation that serves a number of important functions in separating settlements, and preserving 'openness'. Whilst Councils can allocate/make

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Buxton road A53, needs to be rigorous protection from the urban sprawl in order to maintain the 'Queen of the moorlands' identity. The point of entry into Leek from A53 Buxton Road is the most attractive picturesque and Tourist Route. It is also highly utilised public amenity for local residents of Leek who regularly make use of the whole area incorporating the A53 towards Tittesworth Reservoir/Blackshaw Moor, along Thorncliffe Road and its adjoining lanes, the Mount Road, as a place to exercise by walking, rambling, cycling, horse-riding, dog-walking, sightseeing, picnicking and general enjoyment of for health and well-being. The proposed areas particularly as it approaches the a53 Buxton Road junction with Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road, is immediately adjacent to a landscape area which presumes against intrusive developments in order to protect its historic landscape nature. I would personally feel that the Special Landscape Area and environs ought to receive the highest priority protection. The designation encompasses the fact that it is special in nature and cannot therefore be replaced once lost or damaged. There is a number of brownfield sites within the town which could be very effectively used for housing development. For some reason? These are not shown on the accompanying consultation maps. However from attending a consultation meeting the existence of several sites a is a matter of common knowledge along with the fact that these would be 'the preferred option housing sites' in view of the residents of leek. There are also pockets of green belt land (designated such primarily for the purposes of town separation and quite often having no particular beauty or amenity), which in common with other towns in the country could be effectively utilised to expand the town boundary with selective use and sensitively to the environment. This would be better than destroying the areas which are highly valued by the Leek Community for beauty and recreation and which give the town of Leek its identity. The proposal to build almost 400 houses off the junction of the A53 as it joins Thorncliffe Road and The Mount Road is a major intrusion into the public amenity and is unsupported in terms of the additional infrastructure requiring a need for development of roads, sewers, schools etc. The proposal will is completely unbalanced as it places virtually all the housing requirement? Unjustified along 1 narrow lane at the most flagship side of leek renowned for its visual beauty and recreational amenity. Please utilise the brownfield sites and protect leeks heritage and inheritance!	boundary amendments within the Green Belt, National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). Note that landscape quality/character, and public access characteristics, are not in themselves 'purposes' of Green Belt laid out in national guidance. The NPPF allows for consideration of development proposals upon 'brownfield' Green Belt sites. • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • Note that since adoption of the 2014 Core Strategy, there is no longer a 'special landscape area' designation. • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1321 about heritage impact considerations • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response in PO703 about utilities and flood risk
PO1402	Mrs Smith	M			Object	With regard to the proposed 400 plus houses to be built on the mount, I would like to express my concerns on the matter. I can't help but for see the problems 400 to 800 cars will create, trying to leave Mount Road to gain access to the Buxton Road. They will be queuing up! Most families these days have at least one car some have two. Mount Road was not built for such traffic	• See para response to PO120 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1487	Mrs C Lane				Object	I object to any housing being built in this area. It is an area used by many people for walking etc. – many for health reasons e.g. for me. We must keep our open spaces that are in walking distance of our town, once lost – gone forever. Don't let us loose it	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access
PO1710	Mr G Carding				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on Mount Road leek. The Mount has been a historic to the people of leek for generations for its 360 degree panoramic views of natural beauty. Being born in Leek I have walked over the mount all my life and always enjoyed the peace and quiet surrounded by the countryside views which are irreplaceable building housing in this area would also destroy the wildlife and a result in the loss of open space. This road is unsuitable for the large volume of traffic which would be generated by all the new houses and is narrow in places with dangerous junctions at both end of the road. The roads in this part cannot take any more traffic. Please find more suitable site within the town, if we keep building out into the countryside where will the border of Leek End? Ashbourne	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1697	Mr Michael Owen				Object	My wife and I would like to tender our personal objections to any proposed house building along Mount Road Leek. We don't feel that the area has infrastructure to cope with the number of houses proposed and would spoil the landscape of a very popular and picturesque area used extensively by Leek residents	• See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1730	Mrs Mary Emery				Object	LE066, LE067, LE068, LE143a, LE127, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of the land on The Mount My reasons are as follows. There are sufficient brown field site available, such as The former Just juice site on Prince Street is now vacant The former Big Mill on Mill Street, ripe for development The former Brough, Nicolson and Hall Mill on Ashbourne Road A reasonable plot of land on the Organ Ground which was the former East Street Nursery which is now vacant. Shortly to become available the former Britannia Building Society plot of land on Cheddleton Road Land on Foker Grange on Macclesfield road The Mount is a valued area of outstanding beauty and must be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is supposed to be green belt land; consideration that seems to have been overlooked. I would like to point out the impact of the proposed development would have on local services i.e. schools, GP services, the road infrastructure and employment needs. I am also very concerned about the effect on the local wildlife,, the increase in traffic, and noise levels this development will bring. I would like to know what happened to the housing development at the Sainsbury's site, which never seems to have transpired	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE143A, and sites LE067/LE068 are not formally identified as they fall within the town boundary (see para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance). Note the former Britannia premises on both sides of the Cheddleton Rd are both preferred mixed employment/housing allocations, refs LE150 and LE235. • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways The noise impacts of schemes would be assessed against the Council's adopted amenity Policies and NPPF Policies The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1767 PO1760 P O1775	Mr and Mrs W Lovatt Mrs J Lovatt Mr S Lovatt				Object	LE127, LE069, LE128, LE140, LE066, LE142a, LE142b We would like to submit our comments concerning the above consultations with the specific regard to leek east. These consultations with specific regard to leek Ease and the area of mount road. This is a semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of the attractions of this area of leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10minutes walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking jogging and cycling. This is a important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to a nature very close to the heart of leek. The views from the mount are spectacular and largely unspoilt. Any developments of any of all the listed developments of the type proposed would totally alter the area, as it has with the Buxton Road end of Mount road. If all the development listed above were to proceed. In excess 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development especially on the bad junction where mount road meets Ashbourne road near Poplar Service Station.. Access via the already existing estate off kniveden lane and or High View road and Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature off the roads in question and the cars parked on either side of the roads in what is a already busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious consequences Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land that would be ideal for development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development would be ideal of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities and would be more sustainable as they would result from a increase in traffic in outlying areas. Given to the employment situation in Leek, a large proportion of these would inevitably be homes for communities for the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would ruin the character and community feel of the area. Given the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable housing in rural locations, more consideration should be given this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this town.	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE069. • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways Leek is already served by a number of frequent or less frequent bus routes, connecting to centres such as Hanley, Cheadle, Buxton and Macclesfield. A number of these use main arterial routes such as Buxton Road /Ashbourne Road /Springfield Road. In some circumstances, major residential developments may be required to contribute to improved bus routes/bus facilities in accordance with emerging Local Plan Pol T1/Staffordshire Local Transport Plan. • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO677 about design policies • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1558	Miss A Hampson				Object	Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1553	Mrs G Webster				Object	I have never protested before but I feel compelled to write this let reg the proposed developments across the mount. When I was young I lived on Haregate Est and many times my parents took my siblings and I across the mount it was something we enjoyed seeing all the farm animal and wildlife. As I got older I would still walk the mount and dream of one day owning one of the houses which were only a couple of minutes' walk away from being in the countryside. That dream was realised in 1976. Now I am retired it is wonderful to be able to stroll round the mount each day. My husband twice a day come rain or shine, and able to do just that take in the views or have conversations with people we meet, not just from this area but from other parts of town. It is good for the soul as well as the mind. It is a marvellous asset for the town for young and old alike a great place to relax and exercise. It is precious and should be protected for future generations 'never know what you have got till it's gone' comes to mind as was the case with what was a beautiful roundabout which stood proud at the top off Derby St. Do we need so many more houses in leek if so we do not build on the field opposite the cricket club on Macclesfield Road which would not have the catastrophic impact of hundreds of houses on the mount or why not build them on Blackshaw Moor where there is already a small estate. I hope this marvellous asset treasured by so many can be saved for the town and the people of Leek.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt Blackshaw Moor is identified as a 'smaller village' in the Council's emerging Local Plan and should only attract a limited amount of additional housing within or around the built up area. Note that Anzio Camp received planning consent for erection of extra care housing, live work units, ancillary social centre and facilities building and change of use to holiday park in November 2015.
PO1548	Mr P Sinclair				Object	Would like to object to the development of the 350+homes on sites across the Mount. The area is used by lots of people walkers, families with young and older children dog walkers, cyclist, runners, horse riders, all enjoying the wonderful views over the Leek, which has been enjoyed for many years. I've been coming around the mount since I moved to leek in the late 60's, building more houses will mean the loss of this lovely scenery for ever. Also the health & safety factors of all these extra cars 600-700 trying to get out at either end of the mount, onto the Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road which is already busy without adding additional traffic. Then pollution of the air	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1534	Mrs C Whitehurst				Object	I am disappointed that local objections to development along Mount Road leek have been ignored by those who claim to represent us, and I must once again voice my objections. The Mount is one of our most beautiful and well-loved amenities for local walkers, cyclist, runners and dog walkers. A short walk from town which I personally use at least 3 times a week whenever I walk around I meet at least 10-12 others. It is also a safe route to take children of all ages to appreciate the country side, farm use and wonderful views – all of which will disappear. Many habitants for small animals and birds will go along the grass verges and lost trees, so much for our greener landscapes. Who is going to buy these obviously very expensive houses not my children who can hardly afford to rent never mind buy? But I'm sure the overspill from Macclesfield, Manchester + Buxton will appreciate these cheaper houses than they can afford there. Where will all the children go to school our local ones are full and have little or no space to expand, more Drs and Dentists will be needed. Traffic along the mount will be busy. It has already increased during times of the road closures repairs etc, and now this new short out has been found it will continue to be used. As there are now plans in place to convert several old apartments such as old Mills in the town a large number of houses will not be needed by local people and smaller brown field sites can be found in and around leek for a much more acceptable amount rather than such a large estate. If the £1000 per house built is so tempting why not just ask us for more council tax – I'm sure most people would be willing to pay to save this precious area for our children and grandchildren. I would. Please please listen to our objections regarding this atrocity in our wonderful town.	• See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO1349 about tree protection • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus
PO1533	Mrs C Keates				Object	With reference to SMDC local plan notification of consultation on preferred of consultation on preferred options site allocations and boundaries. I must object to the proposed building site of Mount Road Leek. This area is uses by walker's cyclist runners etc. It is an area that can be used in all weather and seasons. It is great use for recreation purposes. Something vital to the community of Leek. I myself have used it for 60years. It is a place of outstanding beauty with in the open spaces and with its views and should not be ruined by the building off houses. Other sites should be found.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1539	Mr B Day				Object	The Mount is a very important area for the town of leek. This whole area is an important amenity area for the town – it was promised a few years ago that there will be no further development after the completion of Mountside gardens. Further developments' will destroy the open views of the Morridge from the town. Some of the areas highlighted for development was gifted to the town presumably to protect them and for agricultural use. Development of the Mount will lead to greatly increased traffic on what is basically a country lane. Safety issues at both junctions. The importance of the local people who use it. Young walkers, runners, joggers, cyclist, horse riding, dog walkers. These include singles, couple. Family groups and organised walking groups aside. We urge you to look at these plans very carefully before you decide to ruin this beautiful area. Surely there are other smaller areas which could be utilized for future needs.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1488	Ms Dawn Garrett				Object	I write with reference to the planning proposals along The Mount in Leek. I moved to Leek last August, the countryside being one of the big draws. I'm dismayed to find that my favourite dog walk is earmarked for extensive development. The absolutely magnificent views would be lost forever. The birdsong drowned out by the inevitable increased traffic load. The wildflowers at the side of the road and the sheep peacefully grazing, all gone. The creeping urbanisation of such a lovely country town is a big worry. Surely it would be better environmental sense to deal with the falling-down mills and derelict housing in the town before building any further? Regeneration is a much more modern concept and would further revitalise the town itself. For me and my family access to the views, the fresh air and the wildlife is balm against our stressful and hectic working lives. I live on Ashbourne Road so this is not NIMBYism at work, it is a genuine plea to save this lovely area for everyone. Now and in the future.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1585	Mr C Chauveau				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I love to go running there with my dad and really enjoy the view into open countryside.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence
PO1590 PO1605	Mr J Jones Mr J Mays-Woodhead				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as I often go there cycling and walking there with my family and I think it is very special place and would be completely spoiled by houses.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence
PO1595	Mr L Emerick				Object	I wish to firmly object to any housing development on the mount as this is a natural beauty spot with open views into the countryside and it should need to be protected. My family often take our dog for walks there and feel it should be protected	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1715	Miss JM Botham				Object	With reference to the proposal for the mount new housing development This is and has been a delightful walk for the people of leek for many years. The older generation will have fond and lasting memories of the courtships over the mount. We as children used it for walking and horse riding in safety to go further afield to Cheddleton Heath. We know in recent times it is an it is a popular route of the Staffordshire moorlands walk. We believe more ought to be done with the brown fields site this would clear unsightly buildings and In most cases be more convenient to the town allowing for less use of vehicles and allowing for less use of vehicles and allowing for the green areas to be maintained for leisure pursuits.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1720	Mr & Mrs V and J Emery				Object	LE066, LE067, LE068, LE143a, LE127, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of the land on The Mount My reasons are as follows. There are sufficient brown field site available, such as The former Just juice site on Prince Street is now vacant The former Big Mill on Mill Street, ripe for development The former Brough, Nicolson and Hall Mill on Ashbourne Road A reasonable plot of land on the Organ Ground which was the former East Street Nursery which is now vacant. Shortly to become available the former Britannia Building Society plot of land on Cheddleton Road Land on Foker Grange on Macclesfield road The Mount is a valued area of outstanding beauty and must be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is supposed to be green belt land; consideration that seems to have been overlooked. I would like to point out the impact of the proposed development would have on local services i.e. schools, GP services, the road infrastructure and employment needs. I am also very concerned about the effect on the local wildlife,, the increase in traffic, and noise levels this development will bring. I would like to know what happened to the housing development at the Sainsbury's site, which never seems to have transpired	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE143A, and sites LE067/LE068 are not formally identified as they fall within the town boundary (see para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance). Note the former Britannia premises on both sides of the Cheddleton Rd are both preferred mixed employment/housing allocations, refs LE150 and LE235. • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways • The noise impacts of schemes would be assessed against the Council's adopted amenity Policies and NPPF Policies

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.
PO1696	Ms Machin K				Object	I would like to object to the proposed housing sites on the mount road, leek as outlined in the preferred options site and boundaries of staffs moorlands local plans – sites LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. This area should not be built on as it will ruin the lovely views over Leek and the Horizon and has been enjoyed for generations by walker's cyclist etc, who on a nice day vastly outnumber cars on this starch of road. This road also appears to be outside the site boundary. By building approx. 400 houses it will no longer be a country walk yet another housing est. The council should be committed to maintaining green belt land and encouraging people to get fresh air and exercise in an age increasing obesity. There are surely plenty of empty mills and brownfield or former industrial sites within the town which could be developed for housing instead of building on open fields. There is also no development proposed in the west end of leek- why not? The planners need to go back to their drawing board and identify more suitable sites across the whole leek instead of concentrating on the one unsuitable area. Please save the mount	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 on highways • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1741	Mr Martin Armstrong				Object	LE127, LE128A, LE142A, LE142B Why turn a place of beauty into an eyesore when the council should be concentrating on transforming areas which are an eyesore into places of beauty. There are so many alternatives to the proposed sites for housing development around leek is without having to take away Leeks most cherished leisure route. Mount Road has long been a source of relaxation, leisure and exercise to the residents of Leek It is used daily by scores of locals who walk, run, cycle, and enjoy the tranquillity of this country lane which provides fantastic views across Leek and towards the peak district. Where else in the area is there such an amenity so conveniently within walking distance and safe for people to enjoy. The Mount is also a natural habitat for wildlife including many endangered species. The like of owls, woodpeckers and many more other birds and small mammals would be severely put to risk and their habitat will be seriously damaged. This proposed totally unnecessary housing development would not only destroy all this but also a place extra stress on the town centre already, struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra stress owns the town struggling to cope with congestion. The large number of extra vehicles would adversely affect road safety and be a danger to the public particularly on both exits from Mount Road. These are but a few of the issues generated by this ill thought out scheme	• See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 on highways
PO2587	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2903	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	The allocations proposed around Mount Road will necessitate highway improvements for example road widening, provision of footways, completing Kniveden Lane to adoptable standard, possible (probable) junction improvements at one or both ends. The removal of the sites between LE127 and LE128a could make the delivery of the required scheme more complicated and therefore requires further consideration including the reinstatement of sites LE069 & LE128b.	Comments noted. See para response to PO91 about highways. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites along the Mount are not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO3655	Mr P Ash				Object	My husband and I most strongly oppose the number of sites on Mount Road, Leek as preferred option for new homes. Both of us have lived in Leek all our lives and for the past 50 years have resided on the Moorland Road. Mount Road is acknowledged as an area of open space for walking, cycling, and jogging and it is a area of free from volumes of traffic? I know my mother exercised, pushing me in my pram walking round the Mount. Building houses either side of the road would most likely make the Mount Road into a main road linking Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road. This road is not sustainable not wide enough to take heavy vehicles and constant stream of Traffic, if numerous houses were to be built either side for Health and Safety reason would require pavements, gutters and drainage all of which will narrow, the width of the road for vehicles, in all probability each house will have 2 cars, which again will increase the flow of traffic. To surface the top of Kniveden lane would make this road a rat race and a highway leading to an increase of even more traffic may I remind the council that when the developers applied for planning permission to build homes on the land behind sunny view at the end of Ashbourne Road – grave concern was exposed by Staffordshire County Council of traffic from the houses converging onto a busy main road, would that not also apply to traffic from the houses converging onto 2 main roads – Ashbourne road,, and at the other end of Buxton road. I would like to draw your attention to the fact when Mr William Milnes gave the land he owned to the council, land where now stands Leek High School, and is playing fields which borders Kniveden Lane and extend on the Mount, there was a clause in the gift of land that this land would be only used for educational purposes. One may also ask the council “where are all families and buyers that require these houses? Leek has not the facilities to accommodate such a huge increase in its population. The Dr's are already working to their full capacity, which schools primary and senior have places for an increase in children of school age? And where will the new comers to the area, travelling from the Mount to Macclesfield or to the potteries will increase the flow of traffic though the centre of the town these were problems with	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways The Council is not aware of any legal encumbrances upon this site. • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1730 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						planning permission to build house on ?? At Leek brook on the site of Joshua Wardens factory, as to the nature of the ground and the fact the earth may have become contaminated from factory work etc. These problems were overcome and rectified and houses were built. Now houses cannot build on this land surrounding Sainsbury's Supermarket because of problems with the land – if land at Leekbrook can overcome the problems with the land around Sainsbury's overcome the problem? And houses can be built on land previously occupied and accommodating buildings.	
PO3644	Mr and Mrs Jones				Object	We would like to formally submit our comment concerning the above consultation with specific regard to Leek East LE127, LE069, LE128, LE066, LE142a and LE142b. These consultations relate to Leek East and the area of Mount Road. This semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of its attractions of this area of Leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10 minutes' walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the Mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking, jogging and cycling. This is important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this, together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to nature very close to the heart of Leek. The combination of these two aspects make an early morning walk or late evening jog across Mount a uplifting and almost spiritual experience. The views from the Mount over Leek are spectacular and are largely unspoilt. Any development of the type and proposed would totally alter the character of the area, as it has with Buxton road end of the Mount. If all of the developments listed above were to proceed in excess of 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount Road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development, especially on the bad junction where Mount Road meets Ashbourne Rad, given the development has taken place from an old development that has already taken place on an old Quarry site and the proposed development on the other side of Ashbourne Road, near to the Poplar Service station, access via the already existing estate off either Kniveden Lane and or High View Rod and or Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature of roads in question are busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious safety consequences. Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land which would ideal for the development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities, and would be more sustainable as they would not involve significant damage to the environment that would result from an increase of traffic outlying	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include site LE069. • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO677 on design policies • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1767 about bus routes • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing It is standard practice for residential schemes which generate a requirement for 'local needs' affordable housing to have future occupation of those dwellings controlled via legal agreement linked to conditions upon the planning consent. Planning applications are assessed against the current Development Plan including the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy Policies.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						areas. Given the department from Leek of major employers such as the Britannia Building Society, a large proportion of these houses would inevitably be home for commuters from the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would totally ruin the character and community feeling of the area, and further issues in relation to the sustainable investment in local infrastructure. Planning conditions stating that the occupiers should have a connection with the local area have repeatedly been shown to be unenforceable in the contexts of the urban development. There have been applications for planning permission relating to these areas before, most notably, in 2007. This was refused on appeal, given the strength of feeling within the local community against this development. Any temptation to alter the town development boundary to facilitate these proposals should be resisted as there is no proven case that the type or amount of development proposed is justifiable. Given in the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable houses in rural locations, more consideration should be given to this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of the town.	
PO4727	Mr D And L Robinson				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a Central Government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself is the site allocated off Mount Road, Leek. At present most of the estates west of Mount Road are below the crest of the Mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of High View Road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along High View Road and Moorland Road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the Town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the Southern and Western flank of Leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the Mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	• See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1349 about streetlighting • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO120 about highways Note that vehicular access to LE127 is anticipated off Mount Road; SCC Highways response referred to above was predicated on this. The Council would assess residential schemes in proximity to approved wind turbines in accordance with Core Strategy and NPPF amenity Policies, and ETSU (as amended) noise criteria etc. • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO4736	Mr M Turnock						
PO4732	Miss CM Hambleton						
PO4742	Mr W Trafford						
PO2014	Mr S Johnson						
PO2017	Miss K Johnson						
PO2012	Mrs G Johnson						
PO2008	Mr Massey						
PO2006	Mrs CM Massey						
PO2000	Mr J Gould						
PO1994	Mr P Clewlow						

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142B in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1992	Mrs S Clewlow						• See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO683 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response in PO703 about utilities and flood risk
PO1988	Mr R Heath						
PO1986	Mr J Heath						
PO1984	Mrs GS Lovatt						
PO1982	Mr M Lovatt						
PO1961	Mrs D Heath						
PO1980	Mrs P Heath						
PO1978	Mr A Heath						
PO1976	Mrs J Guderis						
PO1974	Mr V Guderis						
PO1972	Mr S Hall						
PO1970	Mr M Heathcote						
PO1968	Mr J Barks						
PO1966	Mrs J Mellor						
PO2004	G W Smith						
PO2002	J Smith						
PO1962	Mrs Jane Scragg						
PO1964	Mr Paul Scragg						
PO1998	Mrs G Pointon						
PO2020	Mr B Davies						
PO2022	Mr And Mrs J Davies						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3696	Mrs C Ryan				Object	I am writing to express my objection to recently published plans to build on a large area of the Mount in Leek. Whilst understanding there is a need for some new housing, I feel this area is the wrong place and definitely too extensive. A few points I would like to share which may not take into account the professional opinion but a certainly take a common sense view. The Sainsbury's site was passed as a area for retail and business development with a to build on a small housing estate. This has not been fully developed and I understand it may because there are issues with asbestos and or some other contamination. Yet it seems it is fit for a pub selling food, a children's party play area and a supermarket selling some other consumable goods. If it is the case that there have been some bad decisions made around this site, the council officers responsible for passing this plan should own up and ensure this site is cleaned up. Enabling the plans many locals objected to, be completed. Of course this will mean a cost to the taxpayers whom are left carrying the financial burden of bad decisions made. I have no objection Education Land boarding Mount Road being to extend or build a primary school as have a shortage of places, the concern would be of increased traffic and the requirement for good provision of off road parking at the school if there were to be an entrance on that road. There is a site on the Buxton road Blackshaw Moor which has stood unused for many years since the Army ceased training there. It must have drainage, electrics and water on this site. This would be ideal for a small scale affordable housing site. It would also benefit the local school which has a small numbers of pupils and probably in danger of being closed in years to come Transport should not be a issue because there some buses to Buxton and local bus companies can benefit by providing peak time services. There must be other sites within Leek area suitable for developing. I tried to locate brownfield site on SMDC website but it shows many wordy documents but nothing is clearly stating where these sites lie. This could be my ineptitude but there could be more clarity for the lay person on these issues Building in such a large scale on The Mount would devalue housing already there. This may be viewed as a narrow minded but many people have worked hard and taken out huge loans to secure their desired homes. To effect there in such a drastic way I think is unfair and unnecessary. Most of the housing is currently at the higher end of the market and build social or low cost housing amongst this could be problematic from all prospective. If housing is built at the current level at these sites then who shall benefit those on low paid jobs, where I understand the most need is there are many units built as affordable part share homes unsold and many more privately owned sites of apartments etc. standing empty in Leek.	It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1730 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1553 about Anzio Camp • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4699	Mr And Mrs C and P Deighton				Object	We are writing to register our very deep concern about the proposal to build on the land at the Mount in Leek. Those involved in the making such decisions do not all live in Leek and probably unaware of the enormous importance of The Mount to the people living around it in Leek. The implications of losing this much loved countryside walk are very serious, and far reaching. The close proximity of The Mount to the homes of so many local people means that it is a place used regularly, often daily, for exercise and relaxation, and is vital to their health and mental well-being. A large number of local residents are elderly, and often unable to drive: there are young families who cannot afford a car: there are several care homes that residents come for walks with their careers. What make The Mount so important is that is so very close to people. It offers beautiful views across the fields and means that people, who cannot get out into the countryside further away, can still enjoy seeing the birds and animals here only just a small walk from where they live. People walking their dogs have a natural means of contact and conversation with others – so important especially for those who live alone. To sum up, we all be deeply distressed to lose this place. So many have been walking there all through their lives, the disruption, and seeing the gradual destruction of a cherished part of their lives will bring an increased sense of isolation, and the feeling of depression faced by those in their later years as they become less able to things without outside help. Having the ability to step outside and walk in open surroundings without having to ask for a lift means a lot to someone struggling to retain their independence and enjoyment for life. To build on The Mount is clearly not necessary. There are as we have all been made aware recently, many alterations for example: various Brown Field sites empty buildings such as factories and offices: disused mills, empty houses apparently unoccupied for long periods. In view of the very unpopular bad decisions made, and the continuing loss of trust in the judgement made and continuing loss of and motives, of the planning department many now suspect that the decisions are influenced mainly by financial incentives from Government or other sources. We do not know whether this is true, but it seems obvious to us that a prompt decision to abandon the idea of building The Mount would bring peace of mind to many Leek Residents and go a long way to restoring the publics belief that members of the Planning Department actually do care about, and will respond to, consider and respect the views, the well-being and even the happiness, of the town they responsible for looking after, both now and the future.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3938	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG			Object	[Refer to submitted Representations Report attached to Question 1] which states: The proposed urban extension to the east of the town...- LE127(100), LE128a(47), LE140(63), LE142a(140) and LE142b(40). The proposed extension also accommodates draft reserve sites LE069(42), LE128b(48) and LE066(50). These sites contribute a significant proportion of the proposed housing for Leek. The allocation of these sites, ahead of available brownfield/previously developed sites, is not in compliance Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy, which sets out the overarching strategy for development in Leek. ...None of the proposed allocations are considered likely to come forward in the short term based on the findings set out in the SHLAA (2015). However, we suggest that the allocation of sites which are deliverable within the short term should have been considered to a greater extent in formulating the preferred options due to the significant shortfall of housing delivery across the district. WYG consider that sites in Leek, such as LE243, are suitable to contribute to the short term delivery of housing in Staffordshire Moorlands. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the draft potential allocations weighs heavily on this eastern stretch of agricultural land and it is noted that no potential allocations have been selected within the core urban area.	Refer to Council response to PO3934 under LE127 table Question 10. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO4829	Mrs Scragg	L			Object	I would like for to make it known that I oppose the above on numerous grounds. The Mount in Leek has always been somewhere for the people of Leek to walk, cycle, jog, ride around not just people up end of the Town but people from all areas, young and old and in-between. The views, the Countryside is there for all to enjoy and appreciate, and we do. The road is not big enough now for all the extra traffic that is using it never mind more homes and a school. The Government wants to be healthier, do more exercise, get out and move, where will the joggers, cyclist go? If you sat up there for 24hours you would understand how used The Mount is used for recreation, pleasure and socializing, it's a free beautiful gymnasium – its where the children go to see their 1 st lamb or donkey walkers go to remember their youth and reflect on their lives, it's a place that puts lives into prospective and brings the troubled some peace. Please let we and our children's children keep the mount	- See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO120 on highways - See para response to PO677 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4708	Mr and Mrs A & N Waterhouse				Object	Building 400+ houses on the area known by everyone as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gate way to the countryside would be against everything that "localism" would bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and it's unrivalled and area as a whole acts as a buffer, between the town and the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra houses would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and junctions at either end of The Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work, use the Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield Road with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek Town Centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for houses thereby saving this precious area for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements
PO9091	Ms Sarah Griffiths				Object	I am objecting to the planning of new housing at Mount rd, Leek. The area is enjoyed by young and old alike for generations. We do not need new housing in this peaceful wonderful area. [2015 Options consultation representation also submitted with email].	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO9167	Mrs Kath Fernyhough				Object	Please note that this email is an objection to the following site references regarding the development of Mount Road Leek., LE142b, LE142a, LE140, LE128a, LE127, LE022 We are residents of Kniveden Lane leek, and so we feel that we are well qualified to tell you why this development would be so disastrous for Leek. The Mount is an area of natural beauty which is used every single day of the year, by walkers, joggers, sightseers, cyclists, and people who enjoy it just for the sheer pleasure of the calm, peaceful area it provides us with. It is used by our senior citizens, who use the Mount as a daily walk to help keep them fit, and they enjoy sitting on one of the benches that have been left by the people of Leek for the people of Leek, to sit and chat or pass the time of day with other walkers. Good for the body and soul. It is an area that we, our parents, grandparents and children have enjoyed for many years, and if this development goes ahead our grandchildren and future generations will be denied this. It is an area of natural beauty that is home to a wide selection of wildlife. From hearing the owls hooting late evening and into the night, to the woodpeckers tapping away in the woods. From the bats swooping past in search of food to the kestrels that hover over the ground looking for their next meal. And the home of badgers and foxes. To name but a few. If this development goes ahead the homes of these beautiful animals and birds will be lost. Another loss for future generations and the	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO93 about air quality • See para response to PO1349 about tree protection • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						townspeople of Leek, who you are supposed to represent the views of, so please take the time to read this and understand how passionate the people of Leek are about our beautiful green open space. As well as the above losses, the development will cause many problems. Namely access to and from Mount road. If planning permission is granted for all these new homes, imagine how many extra cars, delivery vans, school buses and refuse collectors will have to use Mount Road. If in excess of 400 homes are built, that will mean that there will probably be in excess of 800 extra cars on a daily basis. Mount road can not deal with this. Our worries are as follows :- The exit from Mount road onto Buxton Road goes straight out into a 40mph area, opposite another junction with Novi Lane. The exit and entry from Ashbourne Road is even worse. To exit from the Mount onto Ashbourne Road you again have to exit into a 40mph area If you want to travel to Ashbourne you have to negotiate a 30% bend onto a very busy road If you want to exit Mount Road onto Ashbourne Road and travel down into town, you still have to join the traffic that is traveling at speed around Lowe Hill bends. This plan is dangerous, foolhardy and beyond belief. As the majority of people who will purchase property on Mount road will work in Stoke on Trent or Macclesfield, this will bring even more traffic that has to negotiate the town centre, which is often gridlocked now, let alone with a further 800 cars a day travelling through Leek town centre. The only other access to Mount Road is from Kniveden Lane, via the unadopted road at the top of the lane. If this road is adopted to improve access onto the Mount, Kniveden Lane will become a rat run, along with Moorland Road. And it will not only be used by the new developments on the Mount, but by the estate accessed from Novi Lane, known as the Haregate estate. Kniveden Lane and Moorland road are residential roads in a residential area, and have not been built for vast amounts of traffic. The noise and level of traffic if this should happen would be very detrimental to a beautiful residential area, not to mention the dangers of traffic moving at speed to residents. Also the exit from Kniveden Lane is notoriously difficult due to the trees which line both sides of the junction reducing visibility to less than 50 yards in either direction. What will you do then, cut down the trees to improve visibility and in the process removing more natural vegetation along with the fields on Mount Road that you are proposing to develop. As an alternative site, why do you not look at Macclesfield Road, the area around Foker Grange. Or develop some of the derelict mills that are lying empty and are nothing but eyesores. This way you would rid the area of the derelict buildings and build new more pleasing structures. We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9066	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick				Object	I am writing to put forward my opposition to the building of houses on Mount Road in Leek. It upsets me greatly to think that an important local amenity could be lost forever if these proposals go ahead. "The Mount" as we fondly know it, is a valuable asset to the East side of Leek, a wonderful place to take our families for walks and bike rides. In our busy lives, it is vital for our health, both mental and physical to have somewhere to go to relax and unwind. What better place than a walk along the Mount with views over Bradnop and Morridge, so accessible from our homes. If the fields in the planning proposals-LE127, LE128, LE140 and most worryingly on the opposite side LE142 were to be built on then the landscape of our beautiful town will be lost forever. For those arriving in to Leek from Ashbourne Road, they would be met with yet another sprawling housing estate, replacing the picturesque fields full of animals that are so welcoming to see. The road will become a main thoroughfare from the Ashbourne Road to Buxton Road and will lose its charm for us all. Lets protect the gateway to LEEK for generations to come. SAVE THE MOUNT.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways
PO9075	Mr Stewart Johnson				Object	I am writing to protest against the proposed plans to build 4000 houses in the Leek area:- 1, question how many unoccupied properties are there in the area 2, Loss of beautiful countryside. 3, Work vacancies in the local area. 4, Local infrastructure . 5, Places at local schools. The list is just a few of the considerations the planners seem to be ignoring. Of particular concern is the proposed development along Mount Road. Not only would this destroy a beautiful part of the town used by many residents,it would also cause serious traffic problems both in the immediate vicinity and the rest of the town. These new residents would have to commute,and the main routes would be right through the centre of town adding to an already serious congestion problem. Why do the planners want to destroy the treasure that is The Queen of the Moorlands!	• See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9082	Mr Simon Tansley				Object	I am registering my objection to the leek plan proposals for building anywhere along the mount (le 142a,b,140,128a,022,127. To destroy this public amenity would be an outrageous and nigh on irreparable act of vandalism. Any one who is even considering this to be a way forwards for leek town should walk from ashbourne road to buxton road to see precisely what we would lose in terms of beauty and nature. This is an asset that Leek should be celebrating not destroying.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence
PO9097 PO9317 PO9408	Ms Sarah Bishop Ms Emily Hodgkinson Ms and Mr Carla and Anthony Hodgkinson and Bury				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the plans for development along The Mount. I was born and raised in Leek as are all my family. I remember being dragged "round the mount" as a child and hated every minute of it. I left Leek in 1986 to pursue my career in nursing and I still return to Leek every weekend and Public Holiday. As an adult, I love going round the mount! I appreciate the openness, the air and the local views. I know it is valued by many local people for similar reasons. It is a wonderful asset to Leek which cannot be found elsewhere. In this age of government encouraging activity and reduction of population obesity, I can walk my dog, savour the views and see nature on the doorstep. Something to be encouraged and supported. Leek is very lucky indeed to have such a wonderful asset as part of its town and councillors would be well advised to recognise its importance to their locality. If councillors wish to see houses, roads and urbanisation as part of their tenure, I suggest they visit "The Potteries" or move to the nearest loss of urban space to understand the impact of building for the short term gain. I live still in the city I came to all those years ago. Back then, it was a new city with limits. Now, every route I can take from the centre is urbanised and each area is stuck "in its time" as architecture and design move on creating areas of decline and disrepair bringing new problems with the passing of time. For the love of Leek and its title of "Queen of the Staffordshire Moorlands" , Councillors need to appreciate what qualities give Leek that title and do their utmost to maintain them. Councillors have the opportunity to do the right thing for the future of Leek, not to bring in a fast buck for a short term gain. I hope the people of Leek are listened to when they say "Save The Mount"! As well as the benefits to Leek having such a widely used and accessible area, one should consider the risks and very real hazards to creating such estates in a position where traffic flow, at both access points to the Mount, is at best, difficult. On exiting Mount Road, on to Ashbourne Road and Buxton Road, there is extremely limited vision in both directions. Whilst currently the traffic flow is steady, and reasonably quiet, my concerns lie with the difficulties which will only grow with increased cars, placing those increased pedestrians walking to the proposed development, at a genuine risk. I am not against the development of affordable housing; what I am against is the travesty of those decisions, by councillors which we elect, to take green belt land,	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						before brown belt land, for potential profit, before the views of their constituency and the future of generations to come. I understand that I am far from alone in my views- I feel they should be taken in to deep consideration before this gem in the town is lost forever.	
PO9134	Mr Richard Harding				Object	It is shocking to think that a much valued area of Leek, enjoyed by many thousands of people each year that gives stunning views over many hundreds of acres of Moorland, is a valued place for recreation by the people to walk, hike, cycle, enjoy or just to rest with the freedom of a tranquil setting over the land of the Moorlands will be destroyed forever and what for, the offer of cash to the Council for each new house to be built to be spent by the Council that we all know will be wasted in ways only Councils inimitably can do whilst the result will be a beauty spot for Leek people will be destroyed forever. The Council can sit back and think the money was worth it yet they sit in splendid isolation allowing the areas they are elected to protect be destroyed. I wonder how the local and Staffs Council can think that the huge increase in housing is necessary bearing in mind that the shameful destruction of a much loved part of Leek will be replaced by huge housing estates on The Mount making it appear like a mini version of the Berlin Wall. I regularly see hundreds of people on weekends and on summer days, walking, dog walking, jogging and horse riding along Mount Road and if these awful plans are put in place The Mount will be a danger to all road users and will take on an ugly factor that is part and parcel of building on rural fields loved by so many people and all imposed without once allowing the voters of Leek the change to have their say on the planning issues that have secretly been imposed. Where is the democratic right of the people of Leek int his issue? Sold out to building firms who look on greedily at the profits they can make with help from a submissive Council who dare not fight for Leek people. It is worrying is that all the planning proposals for the Leek Moorlands were taken in secrecy denying people of the Moorland the chance to put forward their views and objections for all these houses to be built without ever once considering that there is not sufficient employment in the town to employ even 1 in 100 of people who might live in these imposed properties and there clearly seems to be a total the lack of schools to educate the huge increase in children and a the lack of Health Care provision in respect to GP services and hospital care for the area. There is also the huge impact on the roads and the congestion that is already a great problem in Leek. It is as if the Council is blind or inept at seeing the problems that all these extra houses will cause but it seems that everything will be decided in the same manner as the destruction of the old town centre round about we were informed would ease traffic but contrary to all Council ideas the reverse is true. I cannot have any faith in a system that has denied us the vote on these extra 6000 houses or that the much loved Mount will be destroyed in the same cavalier and unthinking way as many planning issues have been allowed to go ahead	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO677 about new homes bonus • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						even when so many Leek people do not want or need these homes to destroy The Mount. I therefore wish to state that I am against the building on any land along Mount Road AKA The Mount, so please register my objection.	
PO9197	Mrs Motum M				Object	I would like to strongly object to more houses being built on The Mount. This very popular location is just a short walk from the town centre where you are in the countryside with far reaching views. The beautiful location will command high prices, therefore no affordable houses will be built. It would be a travesty of justice to build in such a well-loved area, used by dog walkers, walkers, courting couples, and car drivers. I don't think the infrastructure could sustain the number of houses envisaged. Please do not include this area in the local plan.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO120 about highways
PO9341	Mr Derek Kay				Object	Herewith are my objections yet again about building proposals affecting open greenbelt land on Mount Road. I strongly object to delinations LE127, LE128a, LE140, LE142a and LE142b, on the grounds of unnecessary and deleterious incursion into valuable scenic amenities. The fringes of this town (Queen of the Moorlands) must be preserved at all costs. Open aspects across towards the Peak District are essential for our spiritual wellbeing; unwelcome development of additional traffic flow and population density would be the corollary of this building project, were it to succeed. Conversely, there is much brownfield potential within the town boundary itself; rundown old mills for example (which may be protected by outdated listing orders) and other unsightly structures causing blots on the "townscape". Not enough positive action to clean up the interior of this town has been taken over the years. Use compulsory purchase orders where difficult site owners will not cooperate and make the Queen worthy of her name.	• See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Whilst Councils do retain CPO powers in principle, these are generally used (if at

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							all) as a last resort where it is expedient and in the public interest for the Council to do so, where agreement with landowners is not possible. As explained in response to PO91 the Council makes assumptions that development schemes will come forward within the Leek development boundary to contribute to its housing need to 2031, which could include historic premises etc. Applications affecting listed or non-listed "heritage assets" would be assessed against Section 12 NPPF and Council Policies. The Council would also assess schemes in the town centre against the aspirations of the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan.
PO9303	Mr and Ms Gary and Elaine Turner				Object	I wish to object to the proposed housing development at the mount (all of the sites) as this is a high quality amenity area enjoyed by all for its views, indeed, if ever Leek is featured on TV programmes the cameras usually end up doing a view of the town from the mount, which says it all.	- See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence
PO9240	Mr John Burnett				Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. Some background. I have lived in Leek all my life, as have my parents and Grandparents. Throughout my life I have always viewed the Mount as the 'Countryside' and the border between Leek and the Peak district. Since I can remember I have spent many happy hours walking the Mount as it is an accessible area of natural beauty. What makes this area important to me and to anyone who lives in the East end of town. There are very few circular walks that take in such a wide variety of terrain and views as the Mount does. Whichever way its walked theres uphill and down dale terrain that has to be completed. What makes this worth while for many people is the wide open vista that is presented to the walker as you reach the top of the Mount. I complete this walk most days in the Summer, and every week in the Winter, and strongly believe it has added to my health and well being in immeasurable ways. I know and speak to the many others who also make this part of their leisure and health routines and know that a large proportion of the residents of both Haregate and Moorland Road estates rely on this open space as much as I do. So - my main objection is the destruction of some beautiful greenfield leisure location on the outskirts of our town. However I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic	- See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO683 about public rights of way - See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO120 about highways - See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO93 about air quality - See para response to PO683 about economic benefits of housebuilding - See para response in PO703 about utilities and flood risk The Council must demonstrate to planning inspector that its Local Plan is based on the principles of sustainable development. The NPPF is clear that this means three roles – economic, social, and environmental, and that they are

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town. Additionally, I have serious concerns about the effects on the water run off if large areas of the Mount are built upon. The Mount is the highest point in our town, and huge amounts of water drain off it down towards Leek on a daily basis. Without the ground to soak up this water I'm concerned the water table may be affected causing flooding and other damage to residents and infrastructure further down towards Leek centre. The first part of the consultation document says the following: They should, as far as possible, reflect the aspirations of local communities and should strive to contribute towards their wider social, economic and environmental objectives. Based on what I have seen of the document, I don't believe it succeeds in any of these fundamental objectives. Our local community want a town that is prosperous but also one in which people want to live and work. We should strive to be better than what we are but not to the detriment of what makes people want to live in Leek in the first place. I hope you seriously take on board my views as well as the views of other community members. We live in a democracy and as such I genuinely believe that if a decision doesn't have the backing of the community it shouldn't be pushed through.	considered simultaneously. The Council's submitted Policies and objectives would therefore have to satisfy this. • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO9183	Mrs Adams	E			Object	We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9254	Ms Joan Hobster				Object	I am writing to plead for the preservation of Mount Road, Leek, as an undeveloped open space and public amenity, available to all residents of the town. Any building on the farmland that borders this road will destroy the ambience and far-reaching views of this delightful area. It has been shown by a headcount (see Leek Post letters May 11 2016) how well used it is by walkers, joggers, horse-riders etc and I would like to add to that, the small but regular number of cars that are parked on Mount Road by elderly residents. They may no longer be physically able to walk far but can still take a short stroll, sit on a bench, enjoy the fresh air and admire the views. I understand that Mount Road is part of the Staffordshire Moorland 's Way and is walked regularly by individuals and organised groups. Surely a designated "Way" cannot be allowed to pass through a housing estate. In addition I see on the Council website, a leaflet suggesting a walk entitled "Leek Landscapes, A Country Walk" which includes Mount Road. I quote from this leaflet "The route passes through attractive farmland and offers many interesting views of Leek and its setting." If the proposed houses are built, this leaflet will have to be amended. I suggest, "The route passes through a new housing estate which obscures many interesting views of Leek and its setting" If building does take place, Mount Road itself would have to be upgraded and widened, to accommodate increased traffic use. An estimated 600 extra cars daily has been suggested. No doubt street lighting would be installed and this would destroy one of the few "dark sky" areas in the town. I have observed the night sky regularly from this location on winter evenings and enjoyed seeing the eastern constellations, planet alignments, meteor showers, the occasional comet and the monthly spectacle of the full moon rising. All this would be lost by light pollution. I understand that planners did take note of objections raised about the development of Mount Road in 2015 and have reduced the proposed site allocations to either end of the road, thus preserving some of the views. For example, the field referenced LE128 will be split in two and only half of it built on. While appreciating this gesture to public opinion it would surely be only a matter of time before the inevitable "infill" would take place and the whole area would be lost for ever. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE – SAVE THE MOUNT for future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1349 about streetlighting
PO9216	Mrs E Adams				Object	I wish to place my strong objections to the proposals to build house on the mount, leek. It would devastate this beautiful area which benefits tourists and residents alike. Objections also relate to roads, schools, doctors etc. Please please rethink your plans.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO677 about design policies • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							- about Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO677 about educational requirements
PO9273	Mr Jeff Davies				Object	I am writing to object to the designation of land on Mount Road, Leek as 'Preferred Housing Allocation'. There are a number of problems with this intended designation: 1) Overlook from the National Park - building as designated will adversely affect the view from the National Park 2) Access - to increase traffic along the Mount would cause significant traffic problems and hazard at its junctions with both the Buxton and Ashbourne Roads. If Knivden Lane is paved then this would also cause problems with access to the hospital and cause a hazard at its junction with Ashbourne Road where there is poor visibility. Improving Mount Road is likely to be self-defeating as it will then become a rat-run between Ashbourne and Buxton Roads further increasing the traffic load. 3) Services - there would be a significant cost to put in mains services as the existing water and drainage up Mount Road towards Padwick Farm are unlikely to adequate to service the proposed housing 4) Amenity - the Mount is a much loved local resource, heavily used by walkers (including dog-walkers) and runners. 5) Location - the bulk of working residents would probably work in Stoke or Macclesfield and the development is on the wrong side of Leek as it would then increase the traffic 'flow' through the centre of town 6) Brownfield first - development on green fields should only occur when all the available brownfield sites have been used. There are multiple opportunities for in-fill housing developments within Leek (e.g. Prince St) as well as numerous mills that are currently eyesores (e.g. both Macclesfield & Ashbourne Roads) 7) Size of housing allocation - there is a significant discrepancy between between SMDC & Government figures for required housing. I believe you are seriously over-estimating the local housing need. By doing this you are making it easier for developers to cherry-pick which bits they want to develop rather than encouraging development where it would be most beneficial to and have the least adverse impact on the town 8) Unnecessary blight - by over-allocating housing designation you will have an unnecessary adverse impact on the value of	- See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence - See para response to PO120 about highways - See para response in PO703 about utilities and flood risk - See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access - See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements - See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence Property values are not considered as material considerations under the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						properties which may not in practice be affected by housing development throughout the life of the plan	Planning Acts.
PO9176	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson				Object	We are writing as a young couple concerned about the prospect of many more houses being built on good quality farming green field sites in Leek and throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands, especially over the Mount Road in Leek. We use the Mount as many people of all ages do on a regular basis, whether it's to walk the dog or to go out for a run. The Mount is used by many and if lost would be greatly missed. The main issue that concerns me with the proposed building of houses over the Mount is that the council & planners feel it is acceptable to potentially build houses on what is good quality farming green field sites. We need to protect our green spaces and farming land that is producing us with our food and local food at that. Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity. I also have a worry over the wildlife over the Mount there are many different species of birds and animals that are present around the Mount and the building of houses would interrupt them and significantly reduce the numbers of some already endangered species. Finally I urge you think very carefully before allowing these houses to be built in Leek, with a special thought to the Mount, once you have let properties be built there Leek as a lovely small market town will be spoilt and the beautiful uninterrupted views will be gone forever.	• See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to P0223 on housing needs evidence The NPPF expects Councils to meet objectively assessed development requirements, and also encourages brownfield development, subject to wider Policies. • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9190 PO9261	Ms Michele Rushton Mrs Jane Harrison				Object	I wish to register my disapproval re the above development and quite the following points. Loss of an important local amenity – the Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by people across the town. Visual impact - restricting important and highly valued panoramic views across the Leek skyline and further afield. Impact on infrastructure - primary schools in particular (East Street, Beresford) will struggle to keep up with demand and the situation where some children already have to travel to schools in the west of Leek will become more and more common Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging High quality landscape – unsympathetic to the landscape character and quality of the area Urbanisation of the country lane that is Mount Road – if all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The spatial distribution of proposed sites across Leek is unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town so the council will not meet its housing needs in any event The volume and speed of traffic is likely to increase on Kniveden Lane where my family have been residents for over 25years. Please for the sake of Leek and her people, review your proposal. Question where are the jobs to support people buying new houses Traffic & congestion through & around Leek is already critical without the addition of more vehicles. Question why can't brownfield sites/old mills etc be converted to housing · I chose to live near Mount Road because I like it as it is, please do not change it!	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1684 about viability study • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9208	Mr Martin Bagshaw				Object	I would like to register my objection to the proposed housing development on the mount area of Leek. I have lived in Leek for all of my life and I and many others , have spent many happy hours enjoying the scenery and tranquility that this area of the town offers to residents of the town. To develop in this area will drastically reduce the local amenity for the residents of the town. It is a lovely picturesque area that is within easy reach of the town centre. And I believe that to destroy it would be an absolute travesty. The area has many amenity uses, such as walking, horse riding, cycling and jogging, let alone just sitting on the benches and chilling. I think the existing schools will struggle to cope with the increased demand for places. The increase the traffic on the roads surrounding the mount will be significant, and traffic calming measures will need to be considered for safety reasons and quality of life of the existing residents in the area. There also be an increase in commuter traffic from this development. I think the majority of which will have to cross the town towards either Stoke on Trent or Cheshire. This will add to the already considerable traffic issues in the town. I believe the Barnfields, the rear of Sainsbury and Foker Grange Farm would be much better locations, so that the increase in traffic is kept away from the town centre. It was my understanding the houses were proposed for the rear of Sainsbury's. But I understand this has hit commercial difficulties with residual contamination.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • Existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. • See para response to PO1730 about Sainsburys consent • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt
PO9222	Ms Lisa Milward				Object	I wish to register my disapproval to the above development My objection has little to do with extra traffic and infrastructure but a lot to do with losing a place that is very dear to people's hearts. The Mount has always been a favourite short walk of mine and my family's. It is peaceful, has beautiful views and friendly people of all ages make a point of speaking. The Mount is somewhere that I spend a lot of time walking each week, a place that has been a part of my life since childhood. I have very fond memories of spending time walking over The Mount with family when we didn't have a car and little money to take buses elsewhere. The Mount is perfect for a short walk, it's somewhere that I have always felt safe to walk alone and not too far for a morning walk before work and for those people who perhaps struggle to walk longer distances. By developing housing on this land I believe that it will take away one of the town's best assets, one that people of Leek have enjoyed for many, many generations. So as councillors and planners who are in office for a relatively short period of time in comparison making a decision that will remove this for everyone who loves to walk here, I hope that you really consider how much The Mount means to people like me. It will be a huge shame if this goes ahead.	• See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE142B in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9283	Mr Ian McFaul				Object	i am writing to protest against the latest version of the site allocations plan for th Staffs Moorlands, in particular the mount area of Leek. the following objections should be considered a)maintaining the individuality of our market town rather than going down the homogenisation route b)I'm not sure where the demand for these house is coming from - where is the research on households forecasted to require this c)The area of most concern to myself is particularly LE127 and the terrible prospect of houses being built on the town horizon, the entrance to Buxton makes me shudder and we should not go down that route d)there are lots of brownfield sites ripe for development in town that should be exhausted first rather than taking the easy option short term option. e)where i the visionary leader on the council who can set out a plan for the town not driven by short termism	• See para response to PO677 about design policies • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1349 about public consultation and the Statement of Community Involvement

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9325	Ms Elizabeth Stretton				Object	I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed housing development on the Mount Road, Leek - ie Plots IE140, LE128a, LE127, LE142a, LE142b, and LEO22. On the edge of the Peak District, this area of Leek can only be described as an extension of this National Park and one which holds a special place in the hearts of Leek residents. The number of walkers and cyclists using this area each week must be in the hundreds with many, like myself, enjoying the walk over The Mount on a daily basis. This walk commands beautiful views of the surrounding countryside, providing a "country" experience for so many walkers, cyclists and drivers, as well as a place to sit and watch, for example, the sunsets, weather conditions unfold, or simply just to sit and ponder. For years it has provided a walk within a few minutes walking distance, for families, courting couples, dog walkers and anyone else who wants to escape from the town and enjoy the views and the experience pleasures of a "country" walk without having to travel by car and park in an over-priced car park! There are even opportunities for people to drive from anywhere in Leek within minutes to the Mount and then enjoy all the attractions described above. The loss of this walk and seats would deprive many people of the opportunity to enjoy panoramic views across the town and the surrounding skyline: these vistas would be lost and replaced with houses instead - reducing the area to just another street of the kind to found anywhere and out of character with the landscape. It also seems that all the attention has been focused on this area and side of Leek, when there are other areas around Leek which could be made use of. One of the most important problems, as I see it, is the strain on the local infrastructure. Up to, or in excess of, 500 houses could be built along this road and all these new residents will need employment - already a problem in Leek and the surrounding areas and towns - as well as schools for their children. Leek primary schools are already experiencing problems and some children are already having to travel across Leek to receive their education. Recently trees have been cut down on the top field of the High School - now work has started on fencing this area, apparently towards the building of a new primary school on this site. I cannot remember being made aware of this possibility, although it may have been mentioned somewhere, but it seems that the building of this school means that councillors are confident that the housing development will take place and they will be able to wave aside any objections pertaining to education and say that a school is already being built. There are many houses in Leek which are empty, as there are many sites which could be used to provide areas for new homes, and it would make more sense to utilize these possibilities before taking away an important, local amenity which is used every day by so many people and which is our own area of "outstanding natural beauty" and which is available to everyone.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO677 about design policies The emerging Local Plan is not yet finalised and needs to undergo independent public examination by Government appointed Planning Inspector before it can become adopted. Planning applications arising before this happens must be determined against the NPPF and current Council planning policies. • See para response to PO223 on housing needs evidence

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9333	Dr Tracey Cole				Object	I would like to hereby object to the areas of local interest around The Mount being developed (LE142b; LE142a; LE140; LE128a; LE127; LE022). As I am sure you are aware, there is considerable public opposition to the proposed building of 400 houses on these sites. The area is well used, at all times of day for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders. It is an quiet oasis for the people of Leek to experience the calm of the countryside and look down on the splendid views of the town and further afield. As such, it is an extremely highly valued area in the town of Leek. As a resident of Pitcher Lane..building on The Mount would seriously impact on me and my neighbours. The building of so many houses will bring at least 400-800 cars with it. Access for these vehicles will no doubt run straight past my house, causing noise and air pollution. I moved to Leek from Cheshire for exactly the same reasons: the road I lived on became unbearably busy. I noticed that sitting in the garden was impossible with the constant noise of the cars and the smell of the fumes, not to mention the health consequences of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. I am also concerned that with so many vehicles, the junctions of Kniveden/Ashbourne Rd and The Mount/Buxton Rd will easily generate queues during rush hours. Getting off my estate will be far more tricky and the increased risk of traffic and pedestrian accidents is not a pleasant thought. A town like Leek is quite a jewel, but it could so easily be ruined forever if we don't seriously consider all the consequences of our actions.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO93 about air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9422	Mr Anthony Clark				Object	I am writing to make you aware of the concerns I have over the housing proposals for the Mount Road area, Leek, set out in Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Options and Development Boundaries Consultation. The consequence on traffic of building many houses in the Mount Road area will be very marked both in the immediate area and the town as a whole . Immediate area Mount Road is not wide enough to safely take a major increase in traffic. The road is very popular with walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Increased traffic will discourage such use and be a danger to those leisure users who do continue to use the road. The existing access points to the area off Buxton Road and Ashbourne Road are adequate for the present level of traffic but are woefully inadequate and dangerous for high volumes of vehicles. If, as is most likely ,Kniveden Lane was upgraded at its top end to allow access by vehicles the consequences for its junction with Ashbourne Road would be great. At present the limited amount of traffic means that the restricted visibility due to the trees on Ashbourne Road causes minimal problems. An increase in traffic queues would lead to frustration and rash decisions by drivers. This in turn would lead to calls for the removal of the trees and the consequent destruction of a wonderful entrance to the town. Town Residents living in the proposed housing development will need to work and shop. Question where will they go to do these two activities. Work Very few will work in Buxton or Ashbourne which are easily accessible from Mount Road. The vast majority will work in the town centre, the Barnfields industrial estate or on Cheadle Road. Those commuting out of town will be mostly heading for Stoke or Macclesfield/Manchester. All these people will have to drive through the centre of town at least twice a day at peak times as there are no alternative routes they can use. Shopping To reach the two large supermarkets in Leek (Morrisons and Sainsbury's) residents of the Mount Road area would be forced, by the road system, to travel through the centre of town. Those shopping further afield will, in the main, be heading for Stoke and Macclesfield and again will need to travel through the town centre. One look at the map would tell anyone that major building to the east of Leek will cause major traffic problems. If building must take place on the Mount, though I doubt there is a need, the least environmentally damaging sites are LE142b and LE140. Question is there not a possibility of building on the existing sites of Kniveden Hall (which is well screened by trees) and the old Social Services site. These sites would be the least invasive environmentally but would still generate major traffic problems both locally and in town. In 2006 New York took the far sighted decision to turn a disused elevated railway into an linear park (The High Line). Would that Leek had planners and leaders of similar vision to develop Mount Road into The High Lane for the benefit of all the community.	• See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO1349 about tree protection • See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142B is of high landscape sensitivity and development could be visible from the peak Park, and the rural approach to Leek; - LE140 is of medium landscape sensitivity and site-specific mitigation measures including boundary landscaping, and controlled building heights, are recommended; - LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The Council's emerging Local Plan already contains a policy (T2) protecting existing railway lines from development; and supporting recreational re-use etc. The Mount does not contain any such routes.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9373	Councillor Rebecca Done				Object	On the proposed planning for the Mount in Leek..I do not agree with and my reasons are stated below: The Mount is a very important open space close to the town centre which is enjoyed by a lot of people across the town including myself. There will be a massive impact on infrastructure, I think primary schools in particular would suffer (East Street, Beresford) and will struggle to keep up with demand. Mount Road is on the route of the Staffordshire Moorlands Walk – a very popular route for leisure activities such as walking, cycling and jogging’ If all the 6 developments proceed then in excess of 500 houses would be constructed. Mount Road would likely become a main road linking the Ashbourne and Buxton roads. The proposed sites across Leek are unbalanced - there will not be sufficient demand to build all of these houses on one side of town.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO683 about public rights of way • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1684 about viability study
PO9381	Cllr Dani Ogden				Object	An area of natural beauty should never have been considered for planning application in the local plan. The outrage this has caused with local people has been overwhelming. The Mount is an area accessible to open countryside for local people, it is used for recreational purpose and attracts visitors coming to Leek. One lady told me that she could walk safely with a group of people with learning difficulties, the volume of traffic from four hundred dwellings would have a severe impact on those using The Mount for recreation, the infrastructure alone would not only cause a dramatic difference to the landscape it would also affect the wildlife in this area. That said, LE142a [landowner] are against development on this land, also there appears to be no indication on the map as to where the boundary is belonging to [the landowner]. LE127 and LE128a is not suitably distributed to urban infrastructure. It has been suggested LE066 where Kniveden Hall is, Folker Grange and Holme Farm on the west side of Leek are developable.	• See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO683 on ecology evidence The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. Note that the owner of site LE142A, as indicated on the Local Plan proposals map, has confirmed site availability. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The map in the Preferred Options consultation document is intended to illustrate proposed allocations and development boundaries and other summary information, not the extent of land ownerships. • See para response to PO677 about educational requirements • See para response to PO683 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							• See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: LE066 is of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence.
PO9388	Councillor Charlotte Atkins				Object	I am writing to object to the four development sites on The Mount as identified in the proposed SMDC Local Plan. My reasons for doing so are: The Mount provides unique and much valued panoramic views over Leek and its skyline as well as over parts of the National Peak Park The openness of The Mount makes it a hugely important local asset for public recreation and for biodiversity. This is particularly important at present when lack of physical exercise is creating a public health crisis. The Mount is very popular among walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers as well encouraging families to be active and enjoy the natural attractions of the area. The roads up to The Mount are totally unsuited to increased traffic. But if they were improved, that would encourage rat running between the Ashbourne and Buxton Roads totally destroying the quiet rural nature of the area. With increased traffic, the junctions at either end of Mount Road would be highly dangerous. The Mount is a developer's dream and would attract developers who want to build expensive executive homes. These would attract buyers from outside Leek rather than providing the affordable homes we need for both local young and older residents. If 400 houses are built on the Mount, they could potentially generate 800 cars driving through the centre of Leek as the prevailing flow of traffic out of Leek is to Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield. That would create even more gridlock than we experience already. More suitable development sites exist within Leek eg along the Macclesfield Road. But they have not been identified or consulted upon. I urge the Council to drop its plans to destroy The Mount and look elsewhere to develop affordable homes for local residents.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO120 about highways • See para response to PO1140 about affordable housing • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements • See para response to PO93 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO93 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Both the 2015 site options consultation, and the 2016 Preferred Options consultation, mapped sites for various land uses across the District including housing, employment, and mixed uses. • See para response to PO1321 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9415	Mr Alan Percival				Object	I wish to object to the proposed house building on The Mount. Along with many other people I walk along Mount Road several times a week winter and summer. It is a lovely country walk and the only one on the eastern side of the town that is away from traffic fumes. There are many other reasons why building should not be allowed on The Mount which I am sure you have been made aware of.	• See para response to PO120 about open spaces and countryside access • See para response to PO93 about air quality
PO1054	Mr Michael Downs	Leek Co-housing Limited			Support	Leek Co-housing is a company limited by guarantee which was formed in November 2015 by a group of households intending to develop the main part of potential residential allocation 142b as a self-build development comprising about 20 dwellings with shared facilities, live-work opportunities and shared outdoor space. Most of the dwellings will be freehold privately owned homes for the Company's members and their families, the remainder being available for sale or rent at an affordable level to future members of the Leek Co-housing. It is our intention to develop the site according to the principles of sustainable development, minimizing energy requirements, incorporating on-site energy generation, and using renewable, recycled and natural materials as far as possible in the construction. Our aim is to have a low impact on the environment, and to utilize appropriate technologies, and contemporary, natural and vernacular external building materials, in order to harmonize with the local area and landscape setting. In our view site 142b is eminently suited to a sensitive, environmentally conscious residential development for the following reasons: The main part of the site, which is the part we are interested in developing, is in a discreet location, and is not visible from the public highway or from the surrounding countryside. There are a number of trees on the site and on its borders, which it is our intention to retain and which effectively hide the main part of the site from external view. A sensitively designed residential development with lower than average density would enable existing trees to be retained and the development to have minimal impact on the environment. Our development would be set in natural landscaping and would be designed to preserve and enhance biodiversity. The site is currently used as a livery and stables, a business which the present owner says is not viable. There are two stable buildings on the site made from concrete block and corrugated sheeting materials which are poor quality, and a number of other smaller structures of a temporary nature. Our development would replace the existing low grade structures with attractive, environmentally friendly dwellings and shared facilities designed to blend with the landscape setting, providing a net gain in environmental and visual quality. Leek Co-housing is a self-build eco-housing organisation. As the	Comments noted. The Council since April 2016 has publicised and maintained a list of those interested in self-build/custom-build throughout the District, and will integrate the data this provides into its broader planmaking, as required by law. The Government requires that, broadly, demand for SBCB within an authority (arising in annual 'base periods') is met by the authority. The Council will ensure its wider housing policies support those wishing to undertake SBCB schemes (subject to consideration of wider policies); and will consider the case for allocating land for this purpose where this register/other evidence suggests a need for this. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence and other studies. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded site LE142B to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visible from the Peak Park and development could affect its setting; and could also affect the rural approach to Leek from the Peak Park. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council's Core Strategy Sustainable Development Policies set out

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						District Council will be aware it has a legal duty under the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 to support bodies such as ours to identify suitable sites for self-build housing, and to have regard to the needs of such bodies when exercising their planning and other legal functions. Site 142b is one of the most suitable sites in Leek for this purpose. As an eco-developer we are mindful of the consequences of motor vehicles in terms of carbon emissions, pollution and visual impact. Following completion of the development Leek Co-housing will continue as the management company for the site and will apply a green travel plan for the development, which would reduce the average number of motor vehicles per dwelling compared to a typical housing estate, provide charging points for electric cars including one for shared use, and promote the use of bicycles, walking and car sharing.	expectations concerning carbon-saving / water saving in new developments. Schemes may exceed these (subject to consideration of wider policies).
	Petition from Mount residents (1092 signatures)				Object	Dear Miss Ralphs, Building four hundred plus houses on the area known by everyone in Leek as The Mount and used by countless generations as a gateway to the countryside would be against everything that 'Localism' intended to bring. The enclosed petition goes some way to demonstrate the strength of feeling that there is against the proposed building plots as set out in the Local Plan. The area is mainly agricultural and offers amazing views of the town and its surrounding countryside. Indeed the views of Leek's conservation area is unrivalled and the area as a whole acts as a buffer between the town the Peak District National Park. The road itself could not cope with the estimated 600 to 800 extra cars that the proposed housing would generate. The Mount is a narrow road with no footpaths and the junctions at either end of the Mount would become even more dangerous. Historically people travelling out of Leek to work use the Stoke on Trent and Macclesfield roads with few travelling to Buxton or Ashbourne. This would mean that the roads in Leek's Town centre would become even more congested at peak times as these people make their way through town. We urge the Council to think again and produce alternative sites for the houses thereby saving this precious area for the future generations to enjoy.	• See para response to PO120 about landscape evidence The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO120 on highways • See para response to PO1349 about Council Assembly and statement of community involvement • See para response to PO683 about Leek employment land requirements

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1113	Mrs S McDermott				Object	The construction of the 179 houses would cause us considerable congestion on the main Cheadle Road and the a520 together with traffic from the coop (Britannia) buildings at peak times eg: 9am, 5pm, there will be major congestion. This could be a safety issue for the schools opening and closing times. All saints' school opening and closing times, there is already congestion traffic between 4.30pm and 5.30pm weekdays. It is my understanding that Newton House has a preservation order on it as a 1960's construction and the Sir Hubbert Newton placed restrictions/regulations on it the building this needs to be addressed. Surely the land by the canal / scrapyard would be a more suitable l to be built Cornhilll Site LE235 what happened to the affordable housing which is supposed to be built on the Sainsbury's site? Happened as partying the Sainsbury's deal then there would be no need for this development.	The Council consults with SCC Highways and SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC Highways did not raise any objections to this site, however advise that the existing access road into the site could be upgraded to adoptable standard depending on the final proposal; and advise there is good access from the existing roundabout. A Transport Assessment will be required with any proposed scheme, which should look at capacity and operation of existing roundabout and effect on Leek town centre. SCC Transportation also advise that links into the town centre for pedestrians and cyclists would also require consideration. Note that the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement for the developer to provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). The Council is not aware that the site is presently affected by legal restrictions for the uses proposed. A 6.59 hectare industrial site off Barnfield Road, Leek near the Caldon canal was granted outline consent in August 2015 for redevelopment for residential, employment, tourism and leisure uses, retail units and pub, including railway station and marina. However existing industrial areas in use would not generally be allocated to other uses unless re-provision of equivalent or improved floorspace was involved. Site LE235 is also proposed for mixed employment and residential uses in the Council's Preferred Options. The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme, subject to conditions. The Council would assess residential schemes on sites affected by

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							contamination in line with relevant Local Plan policies and NPPF paras 120-121. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer. Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral “urban extensions” around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3.
PO425	Mr David John Allen				Object	Consider the development here should be limited to Housing to fit in with surroundings and be in place of housing on several site Leek East thus retaining the Green Belt area on the mount. This would also give a lesser impact on the road infra structure.	Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. See para response to PO1113 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the Council website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							subject of sustainability appraisal. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence in progressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt. • See para response to PO1113 on highways
PO1426	Mrs B White				Object	I always thought that this area is green belt The build of these houses is going to put a great strain on the resources, esp Compton School resources and the a520 at the moment the volume of the traffic is horrendous, queuing back to the railway bridge very often at 8 am onwards and between 3.30- 4pm and 5-6.30 we residents find it difficult to get into the streets because of the traffic. Neither do I think it's necessary to put? With?What has always been a residential area? We are much overloaded already	• See para response to PO425 about western Green Belt • See para response to PO1113 on highways The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. • See para response to PO425 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1297	Mr Price				Object	Summary - please see attached document for full version) ASNW - Ballington Wood at Grid Ref SJ989553 is adjacent. We are concerned that proposed development adjacent or in proximity to the wood will have negative impacts on it, causing damage and potential loss. Ancient woodland is defined as an irreplaceable natural resource that has remained constantly wooded since at least AD1600. The length at which ancient woodland takes to develop and evolve (centuries, even millennia), coupled with the vital links it creates between plants, animals and soils accentuate its irreplaceable status. The varied and unique habitats ancient woodland sites provide for many of the UK's most important and threatened fauna and flora species cannot be re-created and cannot afford to be lost. With Staffordshire Moorlands District Council showing a valuable above average ancient woodland resource at 3.09% of land area compared to a UK average of 2.5%, it is critical that this irreplaceable natural resource is absolutely protected in this Document and highlighted appropriately. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways: - Chemically through acidification, eutrophication and toxic pollution, - Disturbance by noise, light, trampling and other human activity, - Fragmentation as a result of the destruction of adjacent semi-natural habitats, - Development provides a source of non-native plants and aids their colonisation, - Any effect of development can impact cumulatively on ancient woodland - this is much more damaging than individual effects. We would recommend a buffer zone of at least 50 metres of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect the woodland from the change in land use on the site for each allocation. This 50m should be included as part of the policy for each site.	According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014. The site report acknowledges the site's proximity to this ancient woodland (and Ladydale SBI etc); and factors this into subsequent evaluation/conclusions, recommending a number of further surveys/actions would be appropriate prior to development, including the creation of a buffer zone with the woodland given its AWI status. Also the Council's 2016 ecology study considers the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites, concluding that LE150 "has medium ecological value in its potential to support protected species. The site habitats are considered to be of nature conservation value at district level only. However, more information is required regarding the scattered trees on site in order to establish their ecological importance, and the potential to support a population of reptiles and badgers." Development proposals will need to consider the findings of these reports and will be assessed against relevant Local Plan and NPPF ecological policy. Note that the emerging Local Plan will contain policies specific to tree/foliage protection and already cover ancient woodland protection. The site-specific policy for LE150 will require that schemes incorporate an eastern buffer.
PO1749	Miss S Riley				Object	LE0150 - Leek has many areas which could be regenerated to bring standards up in the community. We should want visitors to look at town and say how wonderful this it is. When so much can be improved within the town why spend the money destroying the already pleasant and ambient areas outside the town? On a personal level, I grew up on a council estate for 28yrs I had as immediate neighbours a alcoholic, a family with domestic violence, a prostitute followed by a drug addict. My 25 yr old sister committed suicide 10 yrs ago. Burglars stole some of her	- See para response to PO1113 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See response to PO1297 An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE150 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						ashes which were never returned despite pleas. Some people may find the drama of this funny or exciting. I do not. I grew up petrified and vowed to go to work to earn enough money so that I never had to live in this sort of environment again. My husband works shifts so is not here half of the time. However due there my house is and its current environment I find I do not feel safe. There is good and bad everywhere but building affordable houses will bring obviously more people, more problems, more anti-social behaviour. Gone would be our peaceful area. Gone would be my feelings of security. I'm not bothered if offices, a cinema, a hotel, a super markets even a mc Donald's is put on this site. If the same or similar foot print to newton house was kept it would retain some wildlife to continue to enjoy. I am however completely against any houses being built. I agree people should have a right to affordable housing but people have the right affordable housing but people should also have the right to live in a more select area should they wish to work hard enough to achieve it.	Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE249 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2582	Consultation Service	Natural England			LE249	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1297	Mr Price				Object	Summary - please see attached document for full version) ASNW - Ballington Wood at Grid Ref SJ989553 is adjacent. We are concerned that proposed development adjacent or in proximity to the wood will have negative impacts on it, causing damage and potential loss. Ancient woodland is defined as an irreplaceable natural resource that has remained constantly wooded since at least AD1600. The length at which ancient woodland takes to develop and evolve (centuries, even millennia), coupled with the vital links it creates between plants, animals and soils accentuate its irreplaceable status. The varied and unique habitats ancient woodland sites provide for many of the UK's most important and threatened fauna and flora species cannot be re-created and cannot afford to be lost. With Staffordshire Moorlands District Council showing a valuable above average ancient woodland resource at 3.09% of land area compared to a UK average of 2.5%, it is critical that this irreplaceable natural resource is absolutely protected in this Document and highlighted appropriately. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways: - Chemically through acidification, eutrophication and toxic pollution, - Disturbance by noise, light, trampling and other human activity, - Fragmentation as a result of the destruction of adjacent semi-natural habitats, - Development provides a source of non-native plants and aids their colonisation, - Any effect of development can impact cumulatively on ancient woodland - this is much more damaging than individual effects. We would recommend a buffer zone of at least 50 metres of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect the woodland from the change in land use on the site for each allocation. This 50m should be included as part of the policy for each site.	According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014. The site report acknowledges the site's proximity to this ancient woodland (and Ladydale SBI etc); and factors this into subsequent evaluation/conclusions, recommending a number of further surveys/actions would be appropriate prior to development, including the creation of a buffer zone with the woodland given its AWI status. Also the Council's 2016 ecology study considers the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites, concluding that LE150 "has medium ecological value in its potential to support protected species. The site habitats are considered to be of nature conservation value at district level only. However, more information is required regarding the scattered trees on site in order to establish their ecological importance, and the potential to support a population of reptiles and badgers." Development proposals will need to consider the findings of these reports and will be assessed against relevant Local Plan and NPPF ecological policy. Note that the emerging Local Plan will contain policies specific to tree/foliage protection and already cover ancient woodland protection. The site-specific policy for LE150 will require that schemes incorporate an eastern buffer.
PO1749	Miss S Riley				Object	LE0150 - Leek has many areas which could be regenerated to bring standards up in the community. We should want visitors to look at town and say how wonderful this it is. When so much can be improved within the town why spend the money destroying the already pleasant and ambient areas outside the town? On a personal level, I grew up on a council estate for 28yrs I had as immediate neighbours a alcoholic, a family with domestic violence, a prostitute followed by a drug addict. My 25 yr old sister committed suicide 10 yrs ago. Burglars stole some of her	- See para response to PO1113 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See response to PO1297 An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE150 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						ashes which were never returned despite pleas. Some people may find the drama of this funny or exciting. I do not. I grew up petrified and vowed to go to work to earn enough money so that I never had to live in this sort of environment again. My husband works shifts so is not here half of the time. However due there my house is and its current environment I find I do not feel safe. There is good and bad everywhere but building affordable houses will bring obviously more people, more problems, more anti-social behaviour. Gone would be our peaceful area. Gone would be my feelings of security. I'm not bothered if offices, a cinema, a hotel, a super markets even a mc Donald's is put on this site. If the same or similar foot print to newton house was kept it would retain some wildlife to continue to enjoy. I am however completely against any houses being built. I agree people should have a right to affordable housing but people have the right affordable housing but people should also have the right to live in a more select area should they wish to work hard enough to achieve it.	Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. The Council's housing/design policies and the NPPF expect that housing schemes provide for variegation in design; and a mix of house types to meet differing socio-economic needs, including affordable housing.

Question 10 Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation LE249 in Leek?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2582	Consultation Service	Natural England			LE249	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Leek. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO78	MR DARREN HOOLEY		Within ADD01 (extension to Churnet Middle School)	Support	This site is situated adjacent to Churnet View middle school and is in the perfect position to accomodate expansion of this school	Comments noted. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of statutory consultee responses and numerous evidence base documents, such as the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO413	Mr David John Allen		Within ADD01 (extension to Churnet Middle School)	General comment	If possible provision to drop and pick school children without blocking road. Draw in bays.	Comments noted. SCC Highways are legally responsible for alterations to the public highway including highway space re-allocation. SCC would undertake measures where deemed appropriate according to its latest adopted Local Transport Plan.
PO2577	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England	Within ADD01 (extension to Churnet Middle School)	General comment	It is important to ensure that extended schools do not lead the loss of outdoor sports provision. There will be more demand from more pupils for curricular sports facilities (indoor and outdoor) to help promote healthy lifestyles etc. but all too often sports facilities are lost as a result of expansion resulting in more demand and less supply. Key schools that are/will become sites will community shared facilities (such as playing fields an sports halls) need to be required to offer secured community use outside of school hours where this is needed in the local area to meet identified needs for sports facilities. This should be a policy requirement.	Comments noted. ADD01 is private land that is not currently identified as school playing fields or public open space. LE140 is not currently identified as school playing fields.
PO2562	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England	Within LE140 (first school)	Object		Playing Pitch Strategy Interim Report April 2017: Consultants KKP consulted with Leek High School who did not raise many key issues - school is considered to have adequate playing field to accommodate curricular demand. Leek High School converted to academy status in April 2016. During the conversion, the School was required to renegotiate its former lease agreement with Staffordshire County Council regarding the School's footprint and in doing so the School lost access to LE140. The field itself is extremely uneven and unsafe in places for any form of school based activity as well as being inadequate to accommodate any form of playing pitch (and historically has not accommodated any form of playing pitch). Through consultation with the School, it was identified that there is little requirement for the field with it only previously being utilised for cross-country running, which is now restricted to its other playing field land due to a perimeter fence causing segregation. The School suggests that whilst there is possible land available to be utilised for any potential first school (as part of the development of Mount Road), this would have to be negotiated with its governing board The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.
PO2852	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County	Within ADD01 (extension to	General comment	In Leek additional land is required adjacent to Churnet View Middle school in order to facilitate potential expansion. It is noted	The Council is currently having on-going discussions with SCC LEA regarding school provision.

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
		Council	Churnet Middle School)		that land in the adjacent housing site has been proposed and we will need to consider options in liaison with the school for extending the buildings and how this affects the external spaces. It is noted however that the school field shares a boundary with District Council owned public open space and it may be that this provides an opportunity to re-provide the school external space that will be lost through extending the building footprint. We would therefore like to meet to discuss what potential exists in this respect to inform the Plan going forward.	
PO1423	Mrs A Williams		Within ADD01 (extension to Churnet Middle School)	Support	This site is ideal for both the school expansion and a new housing development. In addition the development of this site would reduce pressure to build on more sensitive sites elsewhere. The site is less than 200 metres from a bus stop and also a very short walk from the amenities of Leek which would restrict the need/use of vehicles.	Comments noted. See para response to PO78 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO9367	Mr David & Ros Barnes & Tyrrell		Within ADD01 (extension to Churnet Middle School)	Object	Response form submitted [attached] that objects to this proposed allocation: question will the access for school still be via the existing entrance off Haregate Road – or would it use an alternative entrance to be constructed along the track to Wardle Barn Farm. This would be inappropriate [public footpath]. The re-drafting of the town boundary to encompass ADD01 is taking away more greenfield site from the perimeter of the town - unacceptable encroachment on public countryside.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to ADD01 as the road into Horse croft Farm is now almost complete and will ultimately be adopted as highway. Development of this site will be acceptable subject to access design. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. The NPPF expects Councils to meet their objectively assessed development requirements for all relevant land uses, meaning the Council must demonstrate this to Planning Inspector at examination, to have a sound Plan in place. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded site ADD01 to be of high landscape sensitivity as it is open to the north-west allowing long distance views and inter-visibility between the site and higher ground across the valley to the north-west. Development of the site would be visually prominent, and would encroach on the countryside by extending beyond this ridge. Note that landscape

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council will require developers to integrate on-site landscaping/screening mitigatory measures to reduce landscape impacts, as part of a site-specific policy
PO385	mrs Brenda pigott		Within LE140 (first school)	General comment	Rather than building a new first school on LE140 (on Mount Rd) - increasing traffic along this country lane and encouraging more people to use Kniveden Lane and Moorland Rd - why not build the school next to Churnet View Middle school?	See para response to PO9367 about educational requirements Site ADD01 is identified for the necessary expansion of Churnet View Middle School (if this site were allocated for the new first school site instead, middle school expansion would need to occur elsewhere in the town). Note that SCC LEA advise on future educational requirements including their location. The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022 /LE127 /LE128 /LE140 /LE142A /LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate).
PO864	Mr Daniel Noble		Within LE140 (first school)	General comment	Where are the potential locations for new/extended schools in Leek?	See para response to PO9367 about educational requirements
PO9106	Mr Robert McGuinness		Within LE140 (first school)	Object	Email with representation form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sites LE127/LE128A/LE140/LE142A and 'School Site' [presumed LE140] alongside 2015 'Options' sites LE066/LE069/LE128B with the following text: Overdevelopment, traffic congestion issues, inadequate infrastructure, inadequate road network. Brownfield sites and redundant mills should be brought into use first.	It is not considered that development of these particular sites would be out of proportion with the rest of the town. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan; and having regard to the Council's landscape impact evidence. See para response to PO385 about highways National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral "urban extensions" around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note site LE069 is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.
PO194	Mr John Pigott			Support	The plan to build a new first school on land adjoining Leek High School is good as it will allow the new school to use some of the facilities of the High School. The land is of limited value except for dog walkers.	Comments noted. Note that the land is presently owned by SCC, who have indicated that it is available for the proposed uses.
PO9168	Mrs Kath Fernyhough		Within LE140 (first school)	Object	Then we come to the proposed new school development on LE140. This area years ago was used to tip waste, probably unofficially but it happened. Rumour has it that there is asbestos buried there. And so if this proposal goes ahead, this would mean that you are happy for our children to be schooled on top of hazardous waste. This is despite housebuilding being stopped down on the Sainsburys site on Macclesfoeld Road Leek due to asbestos contamination. Would not a better idea be to build the new school, if indeed it is needed, on the site of Churnet View Middle School. We see that under site reference no ADD01, there is already a proposal for a new development to provide more	In general if the Council has reason to believe contamination could be an issue, developers will be required to provide proportionate but sufficient site investigation/ information (a risk assessment) with a planning application, to determine the existence or otherwise of contamination, its nature and extent, and the risks it may pose and to whom/what (the 'receptors') so that these risks can be assessed and satisfactorily reduced to an acceptable level. The Council would assess schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
					classroom area. If the new school were to be built there, there is already parking and school bus areas. The two schools would work hand in hand with the new school automatically feeding into Churnet View School. If the proposed new school is built on the Mount, where are parents going to park when dropping off and picking up their children, and where are the school buses and other cars going to pass along the road. It will mean even more traffic, noise and pollution which will be the end of the wildlife and just another polluted area. Also for the people who walk along the Mount, there are no footpaths. So our schoolchildren will not be safe either. If the area has further street lighting, we are losing one of our "dark spaces". We ask you to do the job you were voted in to do, which is to represent the views of the people of Leek.	The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme (subject to conditions). • See para response to PO9367 about educational requirements Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. See response to PO385 • See para response to PO385 about highways Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: the Mount sites LE022/ LE127/ LE128/ LE140/ LE142A/ LE142B were subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. If the District council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. There is a policy in the Local Plan covering control of all forms of pollution.

Question 11 Do you have any comments on the potential locations for new/ extended schools in Leek?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Allocation	Support Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Issues such as external lighting in schemes can be controlled by the Council's amenity policies. Streetlighting is a matter controlled by SCC Highways. The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public.

Question 12 Do you have any comments on the Leek town centre boundary?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer response
PO640	Ms Alison Conybeare		General comment	please see general comment on previous page.	Comments noted.

Question 13 Do you have any comments on the Leek primary and secondary frontages?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO414	Mr David John Allen		General comment	Provision for car drop off and pick up points	Alterations to the public highway along shopping streets, including highway space re-allocation are a matter for SCC Highways, in accordance with their latest Local Transport Plan. The Council will work with SCC Highways in recommending appropriate alterations where this would be considered to benefit the functioning of the town centre, subject to the Council's adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan and other policy documents. Note that all planning applications arising in the town centre must be assessed against relevant Local Plan Policy and the NPPF, including the consideration of Highways Officer recommendations (for example with respect to provision of off-street parking or loading facilities).
PO426	Mr David John Allen		Support	Looks fine to me.	Comments noted.
PO641	Ms Alison Conybeare		General comment	I have no comment on the frontages	Comments noted.
PO1357	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England	General comment	Map 4.4 Leek Town Centre - Historic England has no objections in principle to the proposed primary and secondary frontages at this stage although it is difficult for these to be meaningful without any policy context at present. It is expected that such policy context would be addressed in the full Local Plan as it progresses and we may wish to comment further at that stage.	Comments noted. The Council's emerging Local Plan contains Policies in relation to development within town centres, and the historic environment, which would be used in the assessment of planning applications alongside all other applicable policies (including NPPF policy), and the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan. The Council will review its existing Core Strategy policies in light of changing policy circumstances (such as the publication of the Housing White Paper), and consult on any proposed amendments to these policies, prior to submission of the Local Plan for examination. Note that most of the proposed primary and secondary frontages lie within the Leek Town Centre Conservation Area.

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Support Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO224	Mr Andrew Bodiam		General comment	The construction of the website makes it extremely difficult to find the comment area. Even your planning operator admitted it was far from easy to find when I was forced to call him for assistance, And I was not the only one.!	The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Leek residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. Responding on the Council's website by using the consultation portal was an option but there were other ways of responding too – by email, completing a form or letter.
PO415	Mr David John Allen		General comment	Houses would be better developed in small pockets , infill where possible. Employment and housing site better kept separate.	Page 25 of the Preferred Options consultation document sets out the residual housing requirement for Leek to 2031 (pursuant to Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy). The Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet residual housing requirements for Leek to have a sound Local Plan in place. This requirement does not have to be met 100% from land allocations – unanticipated development of other urban brownfield/greenfield sites counts too – Table 4.1 factors in assumptions about future windfall housing (resulting in a lower residual requirement). This windfall would include urban sites not formally identified on the map. Applications for residential uses arising on such sites would be assessed on their merits against NPPF and Council Policies. As there is insufficient capacity to meet this residual need entirely from sites within the Leek town boundary, the remaining requirement is to be met from a combination of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and peripheral “urban extensions” around Leek as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. A range of sites are proposed in the plan both large and small to meet Leek’s housing needs. It would be unrealistic to identify only small sites across the town as the Council is required by the Government to demonstrate that sites they identify will actually be built and smaller sites tend to be less viable (for example because of affordable housing requirements, or site clearance costs etc). General employment purposes encompasses light industry/officing through to general industry and warehousing. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses and sustainable development patterns, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise).
PO427	Mr David John Allen		General comment	I feel Leek is a thriving Town with a good mixture of shops. Any new housing should be spread in a linear manner utilising existing pockets on infill , in some cases with minor expansion of the development boundary. Small clusters of new houses would impact less on the existing road infra- structure and allow monies to be spend on housing not roads. Adjustment need to be made to the various speed limits to provide a safer environment for the existing and new houses. Green Belt should be protected as far as possible and priority given to alternative infill site.	The NPPF expects Councils to meet their objectively assessed development requirements for all relevant land uses, meaning the Council must demonstrate this to Planning Inspector at examination, to have a sound Plan in place. Given previous retail permissions in the town, the emerging Local Plan sets out that Leek has a zero requirement for additional retail floorspace up to 2031. It also sets out the primary retail frontage for the town centre and its general extent A range of sites are proposed in the Local Plan both large and

					small to meet Leek's residual housing needs. It would be unrealistic to identify only small sites across the town as the Council is required by the Government to demonstrate that sites they identify will actually be built and smaller sites tend to be less viable (for example because of affordable housing requirements, or site clearance costs etc). The Council consults with SCC Highways and SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to the Leek Preferred Options sites subject to developers funding certain highway improvement measures. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). Speed limits on public highways are a matter for SCC Highways; in some cases these can be adjusted as a result of a development scheme, where deemed appropriate by SCC Highways. • See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance Note that none of the Mount sites falls within the Green Belt, whereas the western edge of Leek has Green Belt status. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence in progressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO642	Ms Alison Conybeare		General comment	I have no further comment to make about Leek, other than to listen to the local residents and prevent further chaos like the roundabout to traffic light change.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation. All public responses are considered by the Council in the emerging Local Plan. The highways alterations to the town centre referred to were required under condition to the Sainsburys Leek redevelopment, following SCC Highways recommendations to manage the town's resultant traffic flows.
PO908	Mrs Tracy McMullen		General comment	Why are there no proposals to tackle the numerous crumbling Textile mills that sit empty. Either restoration or demolition?	• See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for the listing of buildings on the advice of Historic England. Apart from being consulted, the Council does not have any say in which buildings are added to the statutory list. The Council, however, is charged with protecting listed buildings insofar as it is possible and managing any changes to them

					through the planning system. In discharging this responsibility, the Council has to work to the government's advice set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which requires every effort to be made to preserve listed buildings and either keep them, or return them, to active use. Planning applications arising in the town centre would be considered against the adopted Leek Town Centre Masterplan in addition to Local and National planning policies.
PO1372	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England	General comment	Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This means that the plan, as a whole (including the sites it is putting forward as allocations) has to set out a framework which is likely to conserve the historic environment of the Plan area. The Plan puts forward a number of sites which, if developed, appear likely to affect the significance of one or more designated heritage assets in their vicinity. The Allocation of a site for development within the Local Plan is, in effect, establishing that the principle of development in that particular location is acceptable. However, in the case of this Local Plan, at present, there is no clear meaningful evaluation of what impact the development of these areas might have upon those heritage assets. The evidence base relies on the Historic Environment Character Assessment of 2010 and the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (LSCA) of 2008 amongst others. It is also noted that the SHLAA methodology includes reference to constraints and opportunities in relation to the LSCA but does not mention the Historic Environment Character Assessment. In addition, it is noted that the Halcrow Toolkit of 2011 used for the Core Strategy information has been used in respect of the current SHLAA. Table 2.1 of the site rating criteria includes reference to designated heritage assets, but there is no reference to non-designated heritage assets, setting or harm. As such, it is not clear how impact on the historic environment has been assessed and subsequently applied to the site options in relation to them being put forward as allocation sites, other than where mentioned in the associated SA. Even in the SA it is not clear how the sites have been assessed in respect of the historic environment. It is also of concern that Para 1.16 of the draft plan sets out that further evidence base studies will be completed to inform the Local Plan including Landscape and Heritage Impact Study. In the Options Sites Assessments tables, part of the evidence base, it is also noted that Heritage Impact Assessments will be undertaken during the plan production if sites, where negative effect on the historic environment and heritage assets has been identified, are taken forward. These assessments should be undertaken and considered at this stage to ensure that the preferred allocation sites are deliverable in respect of the historic environment but, at present, Part 7 of the SA does not deal with this. In the absence of any assessment of the degree of harm which the proposed Allocations might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the authority cannot demonstrate that the sites it is putting forward for development is compatible with the Plan's own policies for the protection of the historic environment. Moreover, in terms of national policy guidance, the Plan also fails to demonstrate that:- (a) The sites that it is putting forward for development will deliver a "positive strategy for the historic environment" as is required by NPPF Paragraph 126. (b) The sites that are allocated will be likely to "contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment". Therefore, it has not shown that it is likely to deliver sustainable development in terms of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 7]. (c) The sites which it has allocated are likely to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance". Therefore it has not shown that it will be likely to deliver the Government's objectives for the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 17]. (d) It has complied with the statutory duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage impacts of the development allocations and mitigation measures.

				preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Moreover, from the information available there is no evidence that, in preparing the Plan, the local planning authority has had “special regard to the desirability of preserving” any of its Listed Buildings. Whilst it is accepted that S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 does not apply, specifically, to Plan making, the absence of any evaluation potentially brings into question the deliverability of some sites and, for some, the amount of development they can accommodate. When the requirements of the Act are eventually undertaken, it may be found that the quantum of development on some of the sites is, either, unachievable or, at worst, that the need to safeguard the setting of the building actually renders them largely undevelopable. Please note that these comments are based on known heritage assets at a national level and do not include local information available through heritage environment records which should be considered by the local authority.	
PO2578	Consultation Service	Natural England	General comment	With regard to baseline data and additional new sites : The Council may need to check that up to date information on local wildlife sites (Sites of Biological Interest and Biodiversity Alert Sites in Staffordshire) has been referenced when identifying preferred sites. Our previous advice letter dated 14.9.15 gave detailed advice on themes and issues including these non-statutory sites. Natural England no longer has access to this dataset and the as the preferred sites consultation includes a number of additional sites (not considered as part of last year’s consultation) the Council will need to access up to date information to check on any impacts on these sites. Please contact the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (01889 880 100 or email info@staffswt.org.uk) for further information if you do not hold the relevant dataset in house.	The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of ‘Preferred’ allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: all current Preferred Options sites were subject to Phase I ecological surveys between 2014 and 2016; a 2016 ecology study also considered the scope for ‘local wildlife site’ (ie.SBI) designation for all of these preferred options. These studies set out ecological evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Local Plan Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects ‘Preferred’ sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.
PO2628			Support	Natural England welcomes the deletion of those site options described in our advice letter dated 14.9.15 where selection would involve the loss of part or all of local Wildlife Sites (known as Sites of Biological Interest SBI and Biodiversity Alert Sites BAS in Staffordshire). Those sites are LE057 (affecting Ladydale Local Wildlife Site) , LE091 (affecting Ballhay Green disused tip Local wildlife Site and adjoining Brough Park Hall Local Nature Reserve), LE045, 076, 243 and 259 (collectively occupying the remainder of the Ballhay Green disused tip Local wildlife Site This deletion of these site options is consistent with NPPF paras 110, 113, 117 and 118.	Comments noted. The broad justification for the Council’s selection of ‘preferred’ sites over other sites, is site out in the ‘Options Site Assessments’ on the website.
PO2816	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	General comment	LE045: According to information held by the Environment Agency this site is located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 ‘Site Options’ consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council’s selection of ‘preferred’ sites over other sites, is site out in the ‘Options Site Assessments’ on the website. This includes consideration of environmental issues etc following consultation with the Environment Agency and other organisations, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council’s S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO2817	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	General comment	LE076: According to information held by the Environment Agency this site is located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 ‘Site Options’ consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites.

					The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of environmental issues etc following consultation with the Environment Agency and other organisations, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO2818	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	General comment	LE091: According to information held by the Environment Agency this site is located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of environmental issues etc following consultation with the Environment Agency and other organisations, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO2831	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	General comment	The appropriate level and detail of ecological appraisal should be provided for any developments going forward on the proposed site allocations. These should be completed to CIEEM guidelines namely to identify and evaluate the ecological features of interest and potential impacts upon them. The mitigation hierarchy should be employed from the outset of any design and development planning to avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset impacts, both direct and indirect. Many proposed allocations are adjacent to priority habitats and statutory and non-statutory designated sites, including watercourses. In line with the mitigation hierarchy and relevant NPPF sections, i.e. 109, every effort should be made to re-naturalize watercourses, including de-culverting where technically feasible. The main impact on any sites from a developable point of view, are easements from watercourses to help promote Green and Blue corridors and networks where migration and movement along the watercourse banks can occur. This is likely to be between 5 metres, up to 10 metres on some main river stretches. Impacts on water quality need to be assessed, particularly the cumulative impact to ensure the relevant WFD waterbodies do not deteriorate in status and listed measures in the RBMP are taken into account. Collective contributions from specific areas could be used to support innovative land management schemes upstream in the catchment delivering natural flood management to reduce flood risk in the new developments and wider communities downstream. We would recommend and welcome the opportunity to comment on pre-applications to ensure the best opportunities and outcomes are realised.	See para response to PO2578 on ecology evidence The Council would consult with both EA and internal ecology officers over individual schemes, regarding appropriate mitigation measures in light of NPPF policy and local policy regarding the natural environment and flood risk.. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. Note that Local Plan Policy will require that, wherever possible, development will promote the reduction of flood risk by the use of sustainable drainage techniques as per the Flood and Water Management Act., as well as taking opportunities to contribute to wider Council objectives such as its emerging Green infrastructure Network; to enhancing biodiversity and recreation opportunities etc. Policies for sites affected by watercourses will require that early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority are undertaken, and may specify requirement for FRAs. The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to

					these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2857	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	General comment	Whilst we have not assessed each site in detail it is clear that many of them will be crossed by public rights of way which will need to be considered in full as part of any proposed development. We are also in the process of preparing the 4th Review of the Definitive Map and Statement for Staffordshire Moorlands area and the District Council will be provided with copies of the maps and Statement to indicate the alignment of all recorded routes. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council currently hold copies of the existing Definitive Map and Statement which should form part of any discussions with developers regarding the proposed sites. As the Plan progresses we suggest policy provision to ensure that all public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development. If any Public Path Orders are required to enable the development to take place these should be processed alongside the planning application by the District Council. Many of the sites chosen are close to existing urban areas and it is likely that there are non-definitive routes across the sites which should be considered by any applicants. In many cases these routes could have become rights of way by virtue of established usage over many years and should be treated as public. There will also be sites where such usage or historic evidence has already resulted in applications being made to the County Council under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. As the Plan evolves it would be useful to provide guidance to developers/applicants around enhancing the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include: - the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists across Staffordshire where there is currently a shortfall in available access routes. - the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking - the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture The County Council is able to provide further advice and guidance as and when required.	Comments noted. The Council will have regard to the latest records concerning recognised public rights of way and ensure that site-specific policies reference the need to protect (or divert) these, where applicable. Local Plan Policy T2 supports and promotes the development of a network of safe walking, horse riding and cycling routes, linking communities and recreational/tourist areas; and requires that all legally recognised public rights of way affected by development are protected (or diverted where necessary) and, where possible, enhanced. Local Plan Policy NE1 already supports opportunities to increase public access to wildlife sites including supporting the objectives of the SCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan. See para response to PO2831 about draft Green Infrastructure Strategy
PO2923	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	General comment	See attached transport comments in relation to sites.	Comments noted. See Council responses to individual sites.
PO2927	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	General comment	In relation to surface water flood risk you have provided to us recently a GIS mapping layer of the proposed allocations that we have run through our flood risk software. Attached are our initial comments on the sites and it is hoped that these should help identify any potential issues at each site and assist in framing policy for assessment and SuDS requirements. However, we have only been able to undertake a high level initial assessment at this stage and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you further and perhaps identify sites that require further detailed consideration.	Comments noted. SCC LLFA Officer comments have been taken into account during Local Plan preparation; and will be consulted where appropriate when planning applications are received. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. Policies for sites affected by watercourses will require that early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority are undertaken, and may specify requirement for FRAs.
PO2877	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council	General comment	In relation to more general matters regarding the Local Plan's approach and considering the incorporation of policies for the next iteration the following should be considered. A Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) has previously been prepared for the	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage

				Staffordshire Moorlands and its focus and extent was informed through discussion with the District Council. The statement regarding the need for further evidence including a 'Heritage Impact Study' (s1.16) of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan booklet is to be supported and should also be welcomed by Historic England. This Heritage Impact Study should review the previous work of the HEA (and update where required), extend the boundaries of the previous study where necessary and enhance the assessment where appropriate. It should cover all aspects of the historic environment and be undertaken by a suitably experienced historic environment specialist following a detailed brief agreed in advance with Historic England, the SMDC Conservation Team and the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team. We have not assessed each site in detail as it is considered that the Heritage Impact Study (identified in s1.16) will undertake this work with reference to all relevant documentary information and databases (Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Record, National Heritage List for England etc). The Heritage Impact Study should also make use of all available recent studies to inform its assessment including, where appropriate, the relevant Extensive Urban Survey (available on www.staffordshire.gov.uk/ search under EUS) and the historic farmsteads guidance available on the same web pages. Bearing in mind the scale of many of these developments, where appropriate applicants should be encouraged to undertake, as a minimum, a Heritage Statement in support of any application in order to '...describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' (NPPF, s.128). Where more complex remains or larger developments are being considered, then a full Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment should be prepared. In all cases these documents should be prepared at an early stage by appropriately experienced historic environment specialists and they will inform discussions with the Local Planning Authority and their historic environment advisors regarding the need for and scale of any historic environment interventions including opportunities (where appropriate) to enhance heritage assets within a scheme. The Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team would be happy to be consulted by the historic environment specialist appointed to undertake the Heritage Impact Study. We would also be content to advise on the production of Heritage Statements/Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments to inform development proposals and can advise the LPA on, in particular, the archaeological and historic landscape character aspects of specific developments at the planning application stage.	impacts of the development allocations.
PO3940	Mr Richard Percy	Steven Abbott Associates LLP	General comment	These representations are submitted on behalf of the site owner, Mr Leslie Hughes and seek to promote the allocation of the site [LE259] for housing. The site is outlined in red on the attached plan (SAA/2911/RAP) and consists of a two storey club building towards the road frontage with a senior sized football pitch and associated buildings to the rear. It is understood that the club is now closed and the use of the football pitch is at the discretion of the site owner. The site is within the settlement area of Leek, approximately 600m to the north east of the town centre. It is adjacent to the Bode Business Park to the east, which was described as "underused employment area" in the SHLAA Site Assessment Form, extensive factory premises to the west, residential properties to the south and west and a farm and wooded area to the north. The farm is accessed via a track on the western edge of the Working Mens Club site. The site is in a highly sustainable location with access to the full range of retail, community and leisure facilities and public transport. It is noted that the Site Assessment for the site identifies the proximity of the site to a heritage asset and a Local Nature Reserve as being significant effects and the development of greenfield land as being a negative effect. Each of these impacts would be addressed as part of any formal development proposals and none are seen as being incapable of resolution. In terms of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the site is suitable, available and achievable/deliverable. The site is part brownfield and part greenfield. The site has no known constraints which would prevent its development in the short term, other than the designation of the site as an Outdoor Sports Facility in the adopted Core Strategy	The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the Council's website. The football pitch contributes to outdoor sports facilities for Leek, consequently it is not considered appropriate to allocate for housing. Core Strategy Policy C2 states that existing open space will be protected unless suitable alternative provision is made or the site is surplus to requirements. The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy.

				(Policy C2 – Sport, Recreation and Open Space). Evidence will be produced to demonstrate that at least one of the requirements of the policy can be met. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing as required by the NPPF. It appears that the current supply is less than two years and consequently it follows that relevant policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered to be up to date. The Council's SHLAA Site Assessment Form indicates that the site has a net area of 1.48 ha and a capacity of some 50 dwellings. The delivery of the site for housing would assist in meeting the Council's housing requirement in a highly suitable location. Given the above factors, we consider that the site should be allocated for housing purposes. [Location Plan attached].	
PO1329	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	Object	Not all the proposed allocation sites have had ecological surveys carried out. We understand around 11 sites have been added to the proposed allocation sites that were not consulted upon in 2015, and these have not been assessed for their ecological value. The SMDC Local Plan Policy C3 Sustainable Communities - Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 and 8.7.17 references the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, which " will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets." No Green Infrastructure Strategy has as yet been produced. Therefore, we are concerned that this lack of evidence base will not enable good decisions to be made on allocation sites. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys carried out by Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd in 2015 do not comprehensively cover all natural features that the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance list as needing to be mapped as part of ecological networks: the location and extent of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites; Existing designated sites are recognised, but identification of all Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is not as yet comprehensive. In terms of potential allocation sites, there are several where information from the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, other ecological survey reports for planning applications, and habitat data from MAGIC indicate potentially high value habitats, which should be assessed against the Staffordshire Local Wildlife Sites criteria. the distribution of protected and priority habitats and species ; Priority habitats and species are taken to mean those listed as habitats or species of Principal Importance for Conservation in England according to the list under section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, plus those listed on the Staffordshire, and any more local, Biodiversity Action Plan. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys do provide data that would allow identification of some priority habitats, but do not highlight priority habitats where they are present or use the definitions to describe habitats found. Recommendations for further protected and priority species surveys are made, but full information on their presence has not been gathered. areas of irreplaceable natural habitat , such as ancient woodland or limestone pavement, the significance of which may be derived from habitat age, uniqueness, species diversity and/or the impossibilities of re-creation; This includes veteran trees and ancient hedgerows. Records for these features are not comprehensive. Some veteran tree records are available on http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap It does not appear that this database was searched in the desk studies informing the habitat surveys in 2014. The survey reports do not specifically mention irreplaceable habitats. habitats where specific land management practices are required for their conservation; Some mention is made of current land management in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, but important areas are not highlighted. main landscape features which, due to their linear or continuous nature, are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchanges of plants and animals, including any potential for new habitat corridors to link any isolated sites that hold nature conservation value, and therefore improve species dispersal; Good habitat links and recommended buffer areas are mentioned in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, and the information within the surveys could be used to	Ecus Ltd have now completed ecological assessment of all sites includes in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries (April 2016) consultation. A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next Preferred Options consultation.

				identify corridors and stepping stones, but specific identification of these features is not part of the report or clearly and consistently highlighted. Corridors and stepping stones need to be recognised and protected, and their other benefits to visual and access amenity in urban areas recognised. areas with potential for habitat enhancement or restoration, including those necessary to help biodiversity adapt to climate change or which could assist with the habitats shifts and species migrations arising from climate change; The ecology surveys would help identify such areas, and some Visual Open Space and Public Open Space areas are proposed in the allocations plans, but areas to be enhanced in terms of habitat value are not specifically identified. information on the biodiversity and geodiversity value of previously developed sites and the opportunities for incorporating this in developments; Previously developed sites are among those proposed for allocation and covered by ecological surveys, which give some recommendations. However geodiversity is not covered. If ecological networks and other GI features could be mapped for each settlement, this would give a good basis for allocating sites, both for hard development, and for green space and environmental enhancements. This would also provide a framework for any CIL monies, partnership projects etc. to target priorities in the area and improve the environmental quality of each town and village.	
PO1480	Mr Simpson	N	Object	LE102 Site is visually obstructive, outside the towns boundary and is on greenfield access will be required onto a very busy road at a dangerous point	Comments noted. This site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. However the site was subsequently suggested during the 2016 Preferred Options, and is now an emerging Local Plan housing allocation. Note that subsequent schemes would have to satisfy both landscape and design policies; and be acceptable on highway safety grounds. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is set out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities.
PO1481	Mr Simpson	N	Object	Le103 Site is greenbelt I think it is vital that development into open countryside/greenfield site should be fully justified and only when all other options have been fully exhausted. I am concerned that planning decisions such as Sainsbury's site do not appear to have provided the required returns on housing development. This failure shouldn't be at the cost of destruction of green fields	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. A sustainability appraisal report is being published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan July 2017. The SA Report considers the economic, social and environmental effects of proposed development site allocations including access to services and facilities. • See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance

					The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. This permission remains intact because the wider Sainsburys redevelopment has commenced. Residential permissions such as this 'count' as commitments against the residual housing requirement for the town to 2031.
PO2692	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	Object	There is no commentary around the issue of flood risk and how the sites have been chosen with the Sequential process in mind. However, we do note that the sites we previously identified as being the most severely impacted due to flood risk, have not been taken forward to this stage, which we welcome. We have however, identified some sites where further work is necessary and we wish to remind the Local Planning Authority that Sequential Test evidence should be provided and reiterate if these sites are to be taken forward, then a Level 2 SFRA should also be undertaken. At this Preferred Options stage, this work should already be done. However, there is one final chance for this to be undertaken, prior to the Publication Draft towards the end of this year. If it is not done by that stage, the Site Allocation Document risks being found unsound as it will be at odds with the guidance set out in the SFRA Level 1 and potentially, Flood Risk policies that will be set out in the next consultation.	Sites identified are not located in Leek.
PO1733 PO1725	Mrs Mary Emery Mr & Mrs V and J Emery		Object	LE066, LE067, LE068, LE143a, LE127, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B. I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of the land on The Mount My reasons are as follows. There are sufficient brown field site available, such as The former Just juice site on Prince Street is now vacant The former Big Mill on Mill Street, ripe for development The former Brough, Nicolson and Hall Mill on Ashbourne Road A reasonable plot of land on the Organ Ground which was the former East Street Nursery which is now vacant. Shortly to become available the former Britannia Building Society plot of land on Cheddleton Road Land on Foker Grange on Macclesfield road The Mount is a valued area of outstanding beauty and must be kept for future generations to enjoy. It is supposed to be green belt land; consideration that seems to have been overlooked. I would like to point out the impact of the proposed development would have on local services i.e. schools, GP services, the road infrastructure and employment needs. I am also very concerned about the effect on the local wildlife,, the increase in traffic, and noise levels this development will bring. I would like to know what happened to the housing development at the Sainsbury's site, which never seems to have transpired	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include sites LE143A, and sites LE067/LE068 are not formally identified as they fall within the town boundary (see para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance). Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Note the former Britannia premises on both sides of the Cheddleton Rd are both preferred mixed employment/housing allocations, refs LE150 and LE235. • See para response to PO427 about western Green Belt The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation, and SCC have indicated a need for additional first- and middle- school land provision in Leek resulting from the town's development requirements. These are laid out in the Preferred Options consultation document. National planning guidance states that the Council should

					assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). Notwithstanding current commuting patterns, the District as a whole has residual general employment land requirement, and Leek has a requirement (of around 8ha to 2031) and the Council must demonstrate that it will fully meet these along with its housing requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. Government Policy promotes mixed land uses, subject to proper consideration of amenity impacts (such as noise). The Council works with neighbouring planning authorities under its duty to cooperate, to explore opportunities for the meeting of development requirements cross-border. However neighbouring authorities must also address their own development requirements. The Council consults with SCC Transport (regarding strategic impacts) during Local Plan preparation; and has regard to SCC's Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Strategy for the District. • See para response to PO2578 on ecology evidence The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to Preferred Options sites LE022 /LE127 /LE128 /LE140 /LE142A /LE142B subject to development in this area contributing to the improvement of Mount Road including provision of footways and pedestrian links. Also Kniveden Lane should be brought up to adoptable standard with the implementation of footways. Further junction improvements at Mount Road/Ashbourne Road may also be appropriate. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). • The noise impacts of schemes would be assessed against the Council's adopted amenity Policies and NPPF Policies The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. Note Environmental Health Officer did not object to that scheme subject to conditions. The Council would assess

					residential schemes on sites affected by contamination in line with its adopted Policy SD4 and NPPF paras 120-121 NPPF. The responsibility of funding remediation rests with the developer.
PO1754	Mr and Mrs W Lovatt		Object	LE069, LE143a, LE128, LE140, LE142A, LE142B, LE127, LE066 We would like to submit our comments concerning the above consultations with the specific regard to leek east. These consultations with specific regard to leek Ease and the area of mount road. This is a semi-rural area outside the town development boundary. One of the attractions of this area of leek is that the boundaries for development are very closely defined. This means that within 10minutes walk of the town centre you have access to open space, which makes the mount area very popular for leisure activities such as walking jogging and cycling. This is a important when considering what opportunities there are for leisure and exercise so close to town. The fields provide a home for various types of wildlife and this together with the farm animals that graze them, provide access to a nature very close to the heart of leek. The views from the mount are spectacular and largely unspoilt. Any developments of any of all the listed developments of the type proposed would totally alter the area, as it has with the Buxton Road end of Mount road. If all the development listed above were to proceed. In excess 400 houses would be constructed on what is pleasant open countryside. The access along Ashbourne Road and Mount road provide a road infrastructure that would be totally inadequate with the volume of traffic generated by such a development especially on the bad junction where mount road meets Ashbourne road near Poplar Service Station.. Access via the already existing estate off kniveden lane and or High View road and Moorland Road would be impossible to sustain, given the narrow nature off the roads in question and the cars parked on either side of the roads in what is a already busy residential area. Creation of a rat run would have serious consequences Public transport via the bus service would be totally inadequate. There are significant areas of land that would be ideal for development that are presently brown field sites within the town centre and the town development boundary. Development would be ideal of these sites would not impact on local wildlife and leisure activities and would be more sustainable as they would result from a increase in traffic in outlying areas. Given to the employment situation in Leek, a large proportion of these would inevitably be homes for communities for the potteries conurbation and or Macclesfield and greater Manchester. This would totally ruin the character and community feeling of the area, and further issues in relation to the sustainable investment in local infrastructure. Given the recent headlines concerning the lack of affordable housing in rural locations, more consideration should be given this type of development, rather than encouraging urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this town.	Note that the Preferred Options do not currently include sites LE069/LE143A.
PO1761	Mrs J Lovatt				Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan.
PO1777	Mr S Lovatt				The public/visual open spaces proposed by the Council are those mapped in the Preferred Options consultation document. The Council's adopted Core Strategy policies seek to improve public access to open spaces/recreation generally where this is consistent with other policies; and subject to landowner agreement. Note there is no automatic public right to cross privately owned land beyond public rights of way. See para response to PO11 about landscape evidence
PO3645	Mr and Mrs Jones				- See para response to PO1733 about highways Leek is already served by a number of frequent or less frequent bus routes, connecting to centres such as Hanley, Cheadle, Buxton and Macclesfield. A number of these use main arterial routes such as Buxton Road /Ashbourne Road /Springfield Road. In some circumstances, major residential developments may be required to contribute to improved bus routes/bus facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Pol T1/Staffordshire Local Transport Plan. - See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance - See para response to PO2578 on ecology evidence - See para response to PO1733 about Leek employment land requirements Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. - See para response to PO3659 on housing needs evidence The Council's housing evidence points to a need for additional affordable housing across the District. An element of affordable housing will be required for all major housing schemes in the District, as set out in Local Plan Policies. The Council may also require an element of starter homes, and self-build plots on such sites. It is standard practice for residential schemes which generate a requirement for 'local needs' affordable housing to have future occupation of those dwellings controlled via legal agreement linked to conditions upon the planning consent.

					Planning applications are assessed against the current Development Plan including the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy Policies.
PO1526	Ms Angie Guest		Object	le069 Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2 nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1527	Ms Angie Guest		Object	Lee066 Detrimental impact on an important & much valued amenity area. The location provides a green space accessible to and used by the wider population of leek for walking cycling and jogging. The mount follows part of the route of the Staffs Moorlands walk 'Leek Landscapes' managed by the SDMC and marked on the OS 1:25000 map. Described in the leaflet published by the district council as offering a walk 'through attractive farmland with interesting views over Leek. This would be compromised by the development. The panoramic views from The Mount over the skyline of Leek and countryside beyond are 2 nd to none. These would be severely restricted. The scale and the unbalanced distribution of this development sites, concentrated in this part of the town will lead to increase traffic in making the mount a busy road between the Ashbourne & Buxton roads as well as loss of a rural environment outside the town's boundary.	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1562	Miss A Hampson		Object	LE066 Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1563	Miss A Hampson		Object	LE128 Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	• See para response to PO1525 about landscape evidence • See para response to PO1733 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance
PO1564	Miss A Hampson		Object	LEE069 Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability

Question 14 Do you have any other comments to make regarding Leek?

					appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1565	Miss A Hampson		Object	LEE143 Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1566	Miss A Hampson		Object	LE234 Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	Comments noted. Note that this site did not form part of either the 2015 'Site Options' consultation nor the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO1567	Miss A Hampson		Object	LLE134a Any development in the Mount on proposed sites will be visible from some distance, thereby impacting not just on leek, but also the wider area. The infrastructure is inadequate I am not convinced the possibility of infill sites in leek	Comments noted. Note that site LE143A was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation but was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO3920		Hourigan Connolly	Object	Hourigan Connolly is promoting land at Buxton Road, Leek for inclusion in the Staffordshire Moorlands District Local Plan as a housing allocation. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which includes response to Question 14].	See response to Question 6 – response PO3919.
PO3914	Ms Mairead Kiely		Object	We note that planning permission (ref. 10/00042/OMAJEI) was granted on Churnet Works, Macclesfield Road, Leek back in 2011. This granted full planning permission for a new superstore, retail units, employment units and a petrol filling station as well as outline permission for residential development. This permission has been part implemented, for example the foodstore has been built out and is now occupied by Sainsbury's. Although the residential permission has now lapsed, other elements of the scheme such as the retail units could still be implemented under this permission. We note that the red line boundary for this planning permission extends beyond the town settlement boundary proposed in Map 4.1 'Leek West'. We also note that the Churnet Works site is not allocated for development. We consider that the town settlement boundary proposed in Map 4.1 should be extended to include the land contained within the Churnet Works planning permission. We also consider that the site should be allocated for mixed use development, having regard to its planning history and ability to meet planning needs. Given its previously proven acceptability we would suggest this allocation should encompass a range of uses including retail, employment and residential (as previously permitted and considered acceptable at this location) but also	See response to PO3913 under Question 6.

				to include hotel and leisure uses.	
PO3915	Ms Sophie Trough	Pegasus Group	Object	We act on behalf of owner of SHLAA site LE147. The site is being promoted by the landowners as a suitable site for residential development. [Representation form attached].	Comments noted. Note that this site which was included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base including ecological evidence. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). In particular the site forms part of a wider SBI – refer to Core Strategy Policy NE1 which states that development will not normally be permitted across such sites. It is noted that the illustrative scheme provided does not show residential development across the entire site, makes allowance for a badger sett buffer, and provides for the restoration of the adjacent listed well, however development across any part of the site would need to be justified against this policy.
PO3930	Mr Phil Bamford	Gladman Developments	Object	This submission provides Gladman Development's written representations on the Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation. These representations concern the following matters. Duty to Cooperate Sustainability Appraisal Objectively Assessed Housing Need Development Requirements and Distribution Green Belt Review Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries - Leek. [Refer to 2 submitted attachments to Question 1].	See response to Question 6 – response PO3929.
PO3939	Mr Mike O'Brien	WYG	Object	Submitted Representations Report [attached to Question 1]: argues that residual Leek housing requirement should be increased by incorporating a 10% buffer (given previous under-delivery); argues that none of the proposed housing allocations for Leek are considered likely to be developed within the next five years [in contrast to LE243], and therefore the identified housing shortfall in Leek will not have been addressed. Argues current housing density range expectations in Policy H1 are unrealistic ; includes a deliverability/viability overview of Bode Business Park LE243 arguing that the site fails to meet any of the criteria required to safeguard employment sites as set out in Policy EM2 of the Core Strategy (outlined at paragraph 5.2.1 of this report) and should therefore be allocated for residential development.	• See para response to PO92 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • The Council will be reviewing its current Core Strategy Policies following public consultation later in 2017 Comments and confirmation of owner position, noted. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites around Leek are not required.
PO3931			Object	This representation has been prepared by WYG planning & Environment on behalf of Key Plant Automation Limited to support the allocation of land at Bode Business Park, Ball Haye Green, Leek for residential development. The owner of the site is to re-locate the Key Plant Automation business to an alternative location and is considering alternative uses for the present site. This representation aims to demonstrate that further consideration should be given to the allocation of the site for residential use. Council should increase District and Leek housing requirements consequently to allocate more Leek housing sites (including LE243); and revisiting the proposed allocations in light of Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy which states that priority will be given to previously developed sites within the urban area.	All of the sites referenced above are identified as either available now, or potentially available in the SHLAA. The Council communicates with landowners of affected sites to ensure they are available, prior to selection. • See para response to PO1683 about viability study As set out in the Options site assessment tables on the website, a number of sites within the Leek development boundary are not proposed as either preferred allocations or 'reserve' sites owing to the fact that these sites could come forward at any time and be assessed against relevant Core Strategy and NPPF policies. • See para response to PO427 about western Green Belt

					The density expectations set out in Pol H1 were deemed sound by the Examination Inspector, and the NPPF allows for individual LPAs to adopt their own approaches according to Local circumstances. Policy H1 in the emerging Local Plan expects that all housing development should be at the most appropriate density compatible with the site and its location, and with the character of the surrounding area. It also assumes that higher densities will be appropriate in locations which are accessible by public transport. The policy is not considered to 'straitjacket' schemes to a certain density, as it allows for consideration of the surrounding streetscene. Also the Council acknowledges the growing importance of SuDS integration into scheme layouts.
PO9241	Mr John Burnett		Object	I wish to formally object to the plans currently in consultation to allocate land for housing around the Mount Road in Leek. I have other concerns about the wider impact to others who may not view this as important. Leeks infrastructure is already at breaking point. In particular the road system is literally not fit for purpose. Since the short sighted decision to alter the traffic flow through our town was taken, the flow of traffic particularly from West to East has been severely curtailed resulting in large traffic build ups through a normal working day. I can only imagine the building of 100's of new houses on the East End of Leeks existing boundary will at best double the misery already experienced by hundreds of travellers each day and cause untold economic and environmental damage to our market town.	Comments noted. See responses to Question 10 – regarding sites around The Mount.
PO9184	Mrs E Adams		Object	[Sites LE057/LE069/LE066]: We would like to object to the developments proposed around The Mount. This is a very popular safe area to walk. It has a high quality landscape which would be restricted by the developments and traffic would increase significantly on the roads linking Buxton road and Ashbourne road. Visitors to the area also like this walk.	Comments noted. Note that LE057/LE069 which were included in the 2015 'Site Options' consultation was not taken forward into the 2016 Preferred Options sites. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This follows consultation with statutory consultees, and consideration of relevant evidence base. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).
PO9255	Ms Joan Hobster		Object	When making their decisions after June 13 th , I beg the planning committee NOT to allow ONE green field to be included in the site allocations while one brown field site remains a possibility for development. For example, it seems criminal to me to exclude Springhill and Knivedon Hall on Mount Road (LE066, neither buildings of beauty and already Council owned) while destroying green the fields, opposite and alongside. (LE142a, LE128a) We have several old mills in Leek that have been tastefully developed and preserved as examples of Leek's industrial heritage. It would be no loss to that heritage if the remaining ugly, and increasingly dangerous, mills were demolished to provide land for housing. Mill Street is a prime example of this. It is a danger and an eyesore and must give an appalling impression to visitors approaching our town from Macclesfield. PLEASE, NOT ONE GREEN FIELD WHILE BROWN SITES EXIST	• See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. The 2016 Landscape impact study concludes that: - LE142A to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visually prominent and visible from the PDNP, as it is located atop of the ridge that screens views of Leek; - LE128A and LE128B to be of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation

					measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site; - LE066 to be of high landscape sensitivity owing to its location, despite the presence of site screening. Note the findings of this study form part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Its conclusions must be weighed against other evidence. Note that Kniveden Hall LE066 is included as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. • See para response to PO9343 about listed buildings
PO9067	Mrs Suzanne Dimmick		Object	Sainsbury's site would be a far better option for large scale affordable housing on a main road in an already established residential area than in a semi rural area that will be changed forever. I thought that this was part of the agreement to Sainsbury's coming in to town and us losing our roundabout.	• See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The Sainsburys site as part of its mixed use consent SMD/2013/1098 still enjoys residential consent on part of the site. This permission remains intact because the wider Sainsburys redevelopment has commenced. Residential permissions such as this 'count' as commitments against the residual housing requirement for the town to 2031.
PO9177	Mr and Mrs S A Hodkinson		Object	Another point to make is there are hundreds of empty properties throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore if there is really a great need for additional housing which there is no evidence to suggest this. Also in this day and age we as a country are very conscious trying to reduce our carbon footprint and recycling everything possible. Therefore question why does this not apply to housing. There are all these properties sitting empty and you are wanting to build more, do we really need more if we already have so many empty. This includes new builds that have being built in the past twelve months that are vacant. Also question who are you expecting to buy these properties or live in them. There is obviously no jobs or prospects for people to want to move into Leek otherwise they would be here now. You only need to open the local paper or look on the internet there are always hundreds of properties at all prices for sale and up for rent in Leek. If you by some miracle find hundreds of families to live in these houses then question how do you propose to improve the infrastructure. It already takes up to twenty minutes to drive from one end of Leek town to the other and this isn't even in 'rush hour'. We certainly don't have enough schools and the GP's are already stretched to capacity.	• See para response to PO3659 on housing needs evidence The Council's sustainable development policies SD1 and SD3 contain expectations concerning sustainable use of resources within new development; and also support other measures linked to carbon-saving, such as contribution to District Heating etc. • See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO1733 about highways • See para response to PO1733 about educational requirements • See para response to PO1733 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO9210	Ms Margaret Clowes		Object	Mount Road, Leek - Site LE125 I wish to register an objection to the proposed housing sites on the above road. This road is an important local amenity, it has been a favourite place with the people of Leek for years and years. It is a wonderful place to walk, cycle etc., and because it is on the doorstep is used by many people each day. To build on the road (as you propose) would ruin this pleasurable pass time for many people. In this day and age when people are encouraged to take more exercise it seems a backward step. Also to accommodate such a large number of houses and associated vehicular traffic, the road would have to be widened considerably, thus a quiet walk in the countryside would disappear. The junctions at either end of Mount Road are not easy to pull out of. I have witnessed one traffic collision at the Buxton Road end recently and also two very near misses. Since the Amos development was allowed at the old garage site on Ashbourne Road with it's associated highway alterations, the pull out from the Ashbourne Road side of Mount Road is more difficult. Question how will these two junctions cope with the traffic numbers that your proposals would generate. Question why is it necessary to propose such a large number of new houses when there are a considerable number of ones which are already vacant in the town and also a number	• See para response to PO1754 about open spaces and countryside access Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them. • See para response to PO1733 about highways • See para response to PO3659 on housing needs evidence • See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance • See para response to PO2818 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal • See para response to PO427 about western Green Belt

				of disused mills which could be converted to housing. Question why has the majority of new housing proposed for Leek got to be in this area. Years ago there was a proposal to build off the Macclesfield Road, question why is this not included in your proposals. And finally, question why does the local authority come up with one figure when our MP comes up with a lesser one.	
PO9334	Mr Derek Simkins		Object	Response form submitted [attached] which: queries lack of information on Leek's future in the Preferred Options consultation; queries lack of plans to change mills into apartments; queries plan to expand services to accommodate Leek's growth; suggests possible route for link road which links the town's 4 main roads. raises further questions	- See para response to PO415 about Leek housing requirements and windfall allowance The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). These Assessments set out that it would not be appropriate to allocate all initial 'site options', either because they lie within the town development boundary so schemes arising could in any event be assessed against Development Plan policies; or for other reasons. - See para response to PO1733 about highways Adopted Core Strategy Policy T2 sets out the circumstances the Council would support new road schemes; Policies T1 and T2 set out when improvements/financial contributions to the road network are expected. The Strategic Policy controlling future growth of Leek is already set out in Core Strategy Policy SS6A. The town's future development requirements to 2031 are already set out in pages 12-16 in the Preferred Options consultation document. - See para response to PO1733 on Infrastructure Delivery Plan - See para response to PO1754 about affordable housing - See para response to PO3659 on housing needs evidence
PO9223	Mrs Lesley Roberts		Object	Representations form submitted [attached] objecting to: - District housing requirement as this deviates from ONS data - development at the Mount (L127, L128a L140, L142a L142b) on landscape protection grounds (setting of national park); lack of screening;	- See para response to PO3659 on housing needs evidence The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape impact study also assessed impacts from the Peak Park, and concluded that the various Mount sites exhibited low- through to high- landscape sensitivity; it also provided recommendations regarding mitigatory measures where appropriate. It concluded: - LE127 to be of high landscape sensitivity; development within the site would likely be visible from the PDNP and could therefore affect its setting. - LE128A and LE128B to be of medium landscape sensitivity and recommends that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on

				- as development along the Mount will require major infrastructure (roads) - future commuting patterns across town.	the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site; - LE140 to be of medium landscape sensitivity; recommending that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include advanced planting and landscaping on the eastern boundary, and limited building heights in the eastern half of the site. - LE142A to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visually prominent and visible from the PDNP, as it is located atop of the ridge that screens views of Leek; - LE142B to be of high landscape sensitivity as the site is visible from the Peak Park and could affect its setting; and could also affect the rural approach to Leek from the Peak Park. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. - See para response to PO1733 about highways - See para response to PO1733 about Leek employment land requirements
PO4392	Mr Andy Frost		Object	On behalf of our client, The Kemshead Family, we wish to make Representations in respect of land at Mount Road, Leek. The aim is to secure the allocation of the entire site within their ownership for residential development in the emerging Local Plan. We note that the Council proposes an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year across the District over the period 2012 to 2031 (i.e. 6080 additional homes in total). However, we consider this to be inadequate. The requirement should be significantly higher, at approximately 440 dwellings per annum: 320 homes per year across the District is inadequate because it fails to support potential employment growth. It is also unlikely to fully address affordable housing needs in the District. Also seriously doubt the deliverability of the windfall and small sites allowance which has been made in calculating likely supply. For the reasons given [in the Supporting Statement] the Plan is therefore 'unsound' at present. [Refer to attached Supporting Statement letter].	Comments and confirmation of owner position, noted. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites around Leek are not required. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The large windfall site allowance for Leek in Table 4.1 of the consultation booklet is based on assumed potential capacity of redevelopment sites in the town, and differs to that of the other towns. The small sites allowance is based on an average of previous years residential completions.
PO3941	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP	Support	[Site Plan and letter attached to representation, stating:] This letter is submitted on behalf of Renew Land Developments Limited who have an interest in the promotion of land to the west of Mount Road, Leek (site references LE069, LE127, LE128a, LE128b). Site references LE128A and LE127 are identified in the current consultation as "Draft Potential Allocations", and sites LE069 and LE128b are shown as "Draft Reserve Sites". In the case of all of these sites, Renew Land Developments Limited consider that all of the land within the attached red edge plan should be allocated for housing development, including public open space and the retention of existing trees across the site. Housing Requirement In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum in the adopted Core Strategy, to 320 dwellings as part of the review being carried out as part of the Preferred Options	Comments and confirmation of owner position, noted. The emerging Local Plan sets out how the residual housing requirement for Leek will be achieved by a combination of allocations within the urban area, and along the Mount (making allowance for windfall/small sites allowances). Additional housing sites around Leek are not required. Note that LE128b is included alongside LE128A, as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. Site LE069 is not included. The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy.

				Consultation, our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement, as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The proposed distribution of housing across the area is also supported, including providing 30% of the overall housing requirement in Leek (which is one of the three largest towns in the District). The provision of additional housing in the Leek would be compatible with its role and function as a large settlement, containing a town centre, and a range of other services and facilities, including a small hospital, a range of education provision, and a good range of employment opportunities. Leek therefore has a good range of services to support additional housing development. Conversely, developer contributions and / or CIL levies that would arise from additional housing development would also support the improvement and enhancement of public services and local infrastructure where required. Otherwise, additional housing allocations on the edge of larger towns such as Leek would not only meet requirements for open market housing, but it would also facilitate the delivery of starter homes and affordable housing in order to enable the plan to meet the Government's housing objectives.	The emerging Local Plan policy NE2 protects all existing trees on site, or where this is not possible, expects a 2 for 1 replacement. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • See para response to PO4392 about justification for 320 annual housing requirement The justification for the broad apportionment of future housing and employment land between the three towns, and the rural areas under Core Strategy Spatial Strategy Policy SS3, is set out in the Core Strategy (and retained in emerging local Plan). This was accepted as sound by the Planning inspector at examination. • See para response to PO1733 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2307 PO2308 PO2309 PO2304 PO2305 PO2306	Mrs Miriam Burns Mr Burns				Object	I am writing to protest against the latest site allocation plan for the SMDC. To build upwards of 4000 house in our beautiful area is criminal. It is obvious a central government ploy, of threats, then offer of £1000.00/ house has worked. For the SMDC to deny the £1000 donation has no bearing on the decision is pure fantasy. The area most concerned is to myself are the site allocated off mount road, leek. At present most of the estates west of mount road are below the crest of the mount, the proposed sites in places near or near to the crest, which will make them highly visible over a large area, particularly at night with street lighting. The site ref LE127 is of particular interest to me, it is obvious access to the site will be through the south end of high view road with services readily available. If we are building approx. 100 houses on LE127, we can expect a large increase in traffic along high view road and moorland road. Sites ref: LE066 & LE128 will be close proximity to a 35mtr high wind turbine and the plans already approved, which is highly undesirable. The building off 800 houses mainly on the eastern flank of the town does not seem logical. There must be other sites in the southern and western flank of leek which could be exploited; the advantage of this would be to reduce the great impact on schools & amenities in the mount catchment area. Other problems concern electrical supply, gas supply, water supply sewage disposal, which can create serious problems due to the massive local increase in demand.	See response relevant question in site tables for site specific comments

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO22	Mr Robert Moseley				ADD03	Object	Should not be changed to include ADD03, this is Green belt land, so is the other areas, plan inside the boundary only not Greenbelt. This land is for all of us, turn it into public space if you must do something.	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03.
PO32	Mr E Shaw				ADD03	Object	Infrastructure The proposed development site does not have the infrastructure to support the amount of proposed housing by means of the road links as Akeshire Lane is a narrow country lane and resembles a modern day cart track due to the amount of surface water that runs off the hills from Mow Cop eventually in to three natural streams. The roads leading in to Station Road, Halls Road, Mow Lane etc cannot cope with a further amount of vehicles. A further 744 vehicles (assuming each proposed property has two vehicles) plus school traffic using the access roads of Station Road etc would not cope with the vast increase of traffic. The town boundary has to fit around the infrastructure and road links. Tunstall North is an ideal example where the road link was established to the A500 in the early 1990's and then various developments have since been made in the area.	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03.
PO443 PO838	Mr Gerard Hearson Mrs Ruth Hearson				ADD03	Object	The town boundary should not be expanded to include the recently proposed green belt of ADD03. But the town boundary should be expanded to the west of the old Victoria Colliery site, to include a proposed alternative site. Although it's not clear why this site hasn't been proposed by SMDC officials, if it does go ahead, it may also be necessary to move the existing town boundary further south. Consideration should also be given to expanding the town boundary to include land between Bemersley Road and the A527 Tunstall Road.	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03 and Question 21 'Other Suggested Sites'.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO236	Mr Robert Stockley				ADD03	Object	ADD03 - I believe that this site has been thrown into the mix of potential development sites because the the Oxhey site has been overturned and rejected. The planners aren't even aware of other potential site, and are sitting in Leek looking at two dimensional maps, without even bothering to come to Biddulph, and look at the impact of the proposals close up and personal. The councillors had to fight hard to even get the planners to come out to look at other potential development sites. When the planners eventually visited the Victoria Colliery site and Childerplay Lane site, they weren't even aware of the existence of these sites or there potential for development. The Akemoor Lane site would create accident blackspots with the convergence of the Wedgewood Lane/Halls Road junction. There would be increased traffic if a school was built on Akemoor Lane, and the resulting traffic increase would create hazards from parking on Wedgewood Lane, Halls Road, Akemoor Lane, Linden Drive and Smokies Way. The increased school and housing traffic along Akemoor Lane from the Brown Lees area would create a second Accident Blackspot on the junction of Tower Hill Road, which is already a partially blind junction. Therefore I strongly urge that the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane sites are considered in preference, as the residents of Brown Lees already accept that these sites will be developed. The location of a school at the west end of Biddulph would also provide safe easy access to the school, and provide an alternative catchment for school children.	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO867	Mr Jordan Kirkham				ADD03	Object	I object to the proposed development on Akesmoor Lane ADD03 on the following grounds: The greenbelt should stay as green belt and not destroy an area of natural beauty and the development will destroy the habitats of the wild animals that live in that area. Trying to get off Dorset Drive in a morning is currently a nightmare without at least an additional 900 cars from the proposed development thrown into the mix. There is only one point of access in and out of Biddulph and during the winter months there only needs to be 1cm of snow and everything grinds to a halt and takes you 2 hours to make it to knyperlsey traffic lights. The thatched cottage on Akesmore Lane is a listed Building on Greenbelt land and should be left as it is. Biddulph does not require another school if they do not build more houses and Biddulph still has existing housing stock from past development projects that are still vacant and not been sold. If needed extend the existing schools or build on the former Meadows School Site. The railway track that is a tranquil place to walk, cycle and Horse ride will become an alley way between housing estates. Haydon Park would become a giant car park for parents dropping and picking up school children and will become a rat run making it even more of a nightmare. The areas on previous plans for Gillow Heath, Woodhouse Lane and Conway Road have been thrown out and dropped on Akesmore Lane.	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03.
PO921	Mrs Dianne Simcock				ADD03	Object	Extending to Gillow Heath and the area surrounding the Biddulph Valley Way will destroy the Character of the town. Extending at Childerplay and rear of the industrial estate would be building on areas that were previously built on	Refer to Question 19 site table ADD03 and Question 21 'Other Suggested Sites'.
PO9701	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				ADD03, ADD04, BD062, BD063a, BD068, BD069, BD087.	Object	Object to the inclusion of sites ADD03, ADD04, BD062, BD063a, BD068, BD069, BD087.	Comments noted.
PO1083	Mrs E Swinnerton				BD004, BD108, ADD03, ADD04, BD087, BD117	Object	Access roads too narrow for BD004, BD108, ADD03, ADD04, BD087, BD117	County Highways have commented on all of these sites and as the Highway Authority, the Council will follow their advice. BD004 was included at 'Site Options' Stage but not 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries Stage' due to Highway issues. Refer to the site tables in Question 19 which cover highway issues for the other sites.
PO1088	Mr P Bradley				ADD04	Object	Object to ADD04.	Comment noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5039	Mr G Boulton				BD016	Support	BD016 - I support this site	Comment noted.
PO815	Mr Timothy Sproston				BD062	Object	I would not want the town boundary to be extended to include site BD062, due to it's ecological significance and the additional pressure on access to the site via Mow lane Essex Drive and York close. Brown field sites and other sites where there is more than one access point or through road would be much better. There are also sites off the bypass and on the out skirts of town which would have a less detrimental impact on the local community and feel of Biddulph Town. The town boundary should not be moved to include Site BD062 as it goes against recommendations in the "Code of practice on Odour nuisance from sewage treatment works" (www.defra.gov.uk). This document (P.17) recommends that local authorities should avoid encroachment which might cause as an odour/statutory nuisance. By nature of the work carried out there the site often smells. Whilst a prescribed 'cordon sanitaire' is not given, fitting 40 dwellings in this small triangle of land would mean building right up to the boundary of the sewage works, closer than has previously been considered sensible. The field is literally riddled with holding tanks and sewage pipes (not far from the surface emerging from the ground at the lower end) making it problematic for building. These pipes back up occasionally, forcing rainwater and raw sewage out into the field which finds its way into Biddulph Brook.	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD062.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO376	Mr Peter Turner				BD062	Object	BD062 - proximity to waste water treatment works: The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its designed capacity population of 17,000 people (Biddulph WwTW conversion of existing COUF Filters to Nitrifying Sand Filters report for United Utilities by C Gambles CEng, MICE & A Ghaus CEng, MIDhemE 2009) (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes private properties (experienced by 34, 36 and 38 Essex Drive). Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. 1. “The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 2. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). 3. This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and the Environment Agency were forced to clear the pollution (Environment Agency staff (identified by uniforms) in Biddulph Brook witnessed by residents). 4. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities & SMDC to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. It contradicts the following SMDC	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD062.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							LDF Core Strategy statement: “The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is “appropriate for its location” in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 6. The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17,000 residents. The population of Biddulph as at 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of 885 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this facility. This will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the CIL. Email from United Utilities to Cllr G Court 11/3/16 states: “In undertaking an assessment of which sites are most suitable, we feel that it is appropriate to highlight to the local planning authority and the independent examining inspector that when considering a range of sites, our advice is that it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites which are not directly adjacent to a wastewater treatment works. Our preference is to bring forward sites in alternative locations.” 7. Email received from United Utilities by myself on 8/6/16 states, “We have held a recent discussion with officers at the local planning authority regarding the emerging development plan and specifically discussed the possibility of new housing near to the wastewater treatment works. In undertaking an assessment of which sites are most suitable, we feel that it is appropriate to highlight to local planning authorities the proximity of sites near to wastewater treatment works. We have explained that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them.” Therefore, the utility provider advises against releasing development land close to the water treatment works. Evidence of best practice shows waste treatment works not recommended for close boundary development.	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO977	Mr Peter Turner				BD062	Object	The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed..."will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk... " The site is in Flood Zone 2 Neither the distributor road (Marsh Green Road) nor the feeder roads meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. The feeder road is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – measuring less than 8m (Standard = 10m) The feeder road is below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Marsh Green Road) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.3m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Portland Drive and the site off Marsh Green Road is restricted from both directions by a very tight bend and a road narrowing pinch point a maximum width of 5.4m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Marsh Green Road with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) due to the incline of the approach to the junction and tree line obstructions. Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 " Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development." The local community has had unfettered access to this site for many years. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space , protecting the ecology and allowing the	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD062.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. There are well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land. Provision of community enjoyment of countryside and open spaces is supported by the Commons Act 2006. This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. Improvement works to the adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development.	
PO572	Miss Louise Richardson				BD062	Object	I specifically object to site BD062 being moved out of greenbelt and into the boundary.	Comments noted.
PO177	Mr Kingsley Rowland				BD062	Object	I have objections to site BD062 being included in the new town boundary.	Comments noted.
PO965	Mr Christopher Goldstraw				BD062	Object	Do not built on site BD062. New houses should only be built where there is minimal environmental impact. Houses should not be built in such proximity works to a sewage works. Additionally, do not build on sites BD068 and BD087.	Refer to Question 19 – site tables BD062, BD068 and BD087.
PO1086	Mrs S Shallcross				BD062	Object	I object most strongly to the above numbered site and development; I am a resident on mow lane and find the road extremely busy and dangerous now so the thought of even more traffic using the lane fills me with horror. Children use the lane to walk to school either on Oxhey or woodhouse, so more traffic would make it even a worse walk than it is now. We already get a strong smell of sewage some days even this far away from the works, is adding even more houses will surely make things worse.	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD062.
PO9955	Mr C Lunt				BD062	Object	Object to BD062 being included in the new town boundary.	Comments noted.
PO9979	Mr Ray Lloyd				BD062	Object	(Summary) Possible enlargement of the sewage works within the Green Belt is no longer permissible. It is the responsibility of the Council to decide if the Green Belt boundary has to be moved. Because brown sites are available to accommodate 40 houses this is not	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD062.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							sufficient justification to move the Green Belt.	
PO9952	Mr T Green				BD062	Object	Object to Site BD062 being included in the development boundary.	Comments noted.
PO208	Mr Stephen Platt				BD063a	Object	I object to the site BD063a due to site being green belt	Refer to Question 19 – site tableBD063a.
PO5177 PO5185	Mr J. Denton Mrs A Denton				BD067a - c, BD110, BD134	Object	Pennine Way/Thames Drive site cannot support the disruption. Not to build here in the overcrowded areas where traffic flow would be increased to an unsustainable level.	This site is not included in the 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries' consultation document.
PO284	Mr And Mrs G Edge				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I am in favour of removing the following - BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 and am being advised that no positive views to INCLUDE them have been received from the 2015 Consultation. It shows that you agree with us that North East Biddulph is already too built up and saturated. It also preserves the space between us and Biddulph Moor. I understand that the Neighbourhood plan needs to take control of the sites for development, though I don't believe that Biddulph NEEDS this number of houses built when there is insufficient working opportunities in the town. ALL possible new residents are highly likely to be travelling OUT of Biddulph to Stoke on Trent or towards Macclesfield/Manchester. The vision of Biddulph must include developing the Town Centre which are wider, balanced development supports. The By Pass greatly benefits developing the West Side of the Town and in my opinion the plans to develop in those areas fit with the vision for 2030. However, should I need to remind you you of probably "why" you made this decision I have attached below the major reasons why there should be no development on any of the above bricks from my perspective living adjacent to BD067a. Schools Ox Hey First – Considerable congestion already exists as parents park cars on both sides of the road in many places – extending for hundreds of yards each side of the school entrance. Cars currently are also parked on each side of Firwood Road and there is no reason to expect this to change should a formal road into BD067 come into being. Woodhouse Middle School – Existing congestion on both sides of the road already and any development increasing traffic from the proposed site will need to exit onto Woodhouse Lane, certainly from (BD067C) along with any traffic exiting Pennine way	This site is not included in the 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries' consultation document.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							from Firwood Road to Woodhouse Lane. I'm advised that Ox Hey School is already at capacity and Woodhouse Academy has had to build school extensions to accommodate the increased numbers – further increases WILL exacerbate the congestion and accident risk. So any new development would need to service further numbers of school children who, being unable to get access, would need to travel – By Car – to other schools, further increasing traffic volume/congestion. Traffic The Selectus Development of 270 houses (as yet unfinished at this time) has one more road to be completed which exits onto Pennine Way as does Geneva Way from this site. Further Traffic exiting from Firwood Road would considerably increase traffic flow in an area already difficult to drive through at school times. Cars already park on each side of Firwood Road currently – that would be unlikely to change making exit from the proposed site even more hazardous. Traffic density has already increased as a result of building of 270 houses (currently +245) on the old Selectus Site (which was at least "A Brown Field Site") and that has already increased the traffic safety issues relating to both schools. Any traffic exiting BD607C on to Woodhouse "Lane" – LANE being the operative word is certainly not wide enough to accommodate further traffic volume. Indeed not that long ago there was a major accident just above this proposed block where both police & ambulances were in attendance and last weekend a car (May 2016) had overturned on the road at the side of BD067c – police were called and the road was closed for some time. Increased traffic would certainly not improve the safety on Woodhouse Lane at this point, which is more reasonably described as a country lane from above Pennine Way to the farms above. There are no public footpaths on this stretch of road either so public safety would again be a major increasing issue. Nature Conservation Many people have purchased property on Fields Side of Pennine Way because of the peaceful, tranquil, pleasant views. Indeed most of us probably paid over the market value and invested significantly in our properties in order to maximise the pleasure we gain from that environment – Many of us in retirement. The Land you propose to develop IS GREEN BELT and as such should be protected – by definition – from such development – clearly the morals/values that set these criteria are now are no longer being treated with the respect it	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							deserves – Such is the world we now live in. Plots BD067A and DB067b currently accessed from Firwood Road have Public Right of Way and where numerous people regularly exercise their dogs or just simple walk for pleasure, hence this proposal would deprive the local community of the ability to use this space. Furthermore, with reference to “Green Belt” from the House of Commons Library it states – “Government policy on protection for the green belt is set out in Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The fundamental aim of the green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently green. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings be regarded as “Inappropriate” for the green belt. In the same document the NPPF states that Green Belt “should only be used in Exceptional Circumstances” which they further outline . In my opinion the proposed development of BD067a, BD067b & BD067c “Do Not Satisfy” the definitions stated as “exceptional circumstances”. Community The proposed development of the five proposed blocks would reduce the boundary between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor – reduced even further should the blocks designated at Biddulph Moor become developed. Biddulph Moor has its own Community and a merger would no doubt happen in the future if current proposals were actioned. This should not be allowed to happen Flooding Risk Whilst I would not suggest there is a major flooding risk I can tell you that there has already been one major flood disaster following major storms which flooded the bungalow below us and caused major damage. Indeed the water flowed beyond the properties by the fields, over the road and in to properties on the other side of the road. Whenever we have storms there is always a pool of water in the field feet away from our boundary fence (Photo’s attached - for example taken Nov 2015 – IS TYPICAL). There is clearly an issue to be addressed as to the suitability of this land to be built on. Amenity When the potential scale of the development in this area, since 2013, can range from 640 – 730 new houses in a well confined area it is reasonable to conclude that the levels of noise from increased traffic would be such as to make a major adverse quality difference. Further to this all the existing properties East of Pennine Way would unquestionably lose any privacy at the rear of the property and further more as	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							the development rises beyond the level of Pennine Way all our properties would be totally overlooked. Furthermore, Furthermore the Private House component on the “Selectus” Bovis site are proving “So Difficult to Sell” that as a result social housing has had to be substituted – In other words there is no real market for private housing of the order being propositioned and certainly on this evidence no case to build 480 more houses along Pennine Way. Access – BD067b BD067b is “sandwiched between BD067a & BD067c. From BD067c, BD067b can only be accessed from Woodhouse Lane. As stated above the road at this point on Woodhouse Lane is more a Country Lane than road and would be inappropriate to have as a vehicular access/exit. Furthermore BD067b cannot be accessed from BD067a since the house boundary garden line (Firwood Road pavement next to the property) is some 2.5 metres from the BD067d boundary into BD067a. This being the case – you can’t build on BD067b in isolation which makes the scale of what you would need to build totally unacceptable in size considering the potential scale of the development in these blocks as covered below. Scale of the Development Areas BD067a + BD067b + DB067c are defined as having the capacity to build 120 + 150 + 120 houses. A total of 390 new houses. Add to this the 270 houses on the “Selectus” sight and you have more than 660 new houses then built in and around the existing area. This would fundamentally change the current local environment and have major “add on” effects detrimental to the community as it is. This could be even worse if you add the projected addition houses on BD110 + BD134 (50 + 40) to this figure. IF Green Field sites are to be considered then the areas with the potential to cause the major downsides of the Pennine Way/Thames Drive blocks would have to be considered. For examples the West part of the town from Brown Lees (Tower Hill Road), Akemoor Lane - which has less than 10 residential properties along the whole length of the lane and is mostly Green Fields on BOTH sides of the road, Equally the road out of Brown Lees in the opposite direction has few residential buildings and fields to both sides of the road. Such expansion to the West would be more sensible/logical than Pennine/Thames Drive	
PO321	Frank Cottrell				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c,	Support	Although I agree with the removal of BD067a,BD067b,BD067c,BD110,BD134,a proposed site would be the old Victoria Colliery site and Childerplay	Comments noted. See responses to Question 19 which explain the Council’s position on the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road sites.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
					BD110 and BD134		Road site. I am glad to see that there is no URBAN CREEP on to Biddulph Moor, we need to keep our own identity. Would it be possible for the council to purchase the above sites and designate them Public open spaces because at the moment they are use quite a lot by dog walkers. We need a park in Biddulph why not take the opportunity to purchase these sites and provide a park and protect us from URBAN CREEP in the future.	Sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 are all privately owned and purchase by the Council is highly unlikely as the land cost would be prohibitive and use as open space would be expensive for the Council.
PO285	Mr David Spruce				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support the removal of Pennine Way / Thames Drive sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134. Thanks for listening to the residents and sparing this over-developed portion of Biddulph even further. There is precious-little separation between this area and Biddulph Moor as it is without adding more housing.	Comments noted.
PO531 PO591	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	As a resident of North East Biddulph and very concerned about the previously proposed sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 along behind Pennine Way, Torville Drive, etc. I am very pleased to support the change their status to constrained. I understand that the Green Belt Review rejected these as being too close to Biddulph Moor and if built on create urban sprawl taking the two areas much too close to each other. It is good for Biddulph that the Pennine Way, etc. sites are taken off, North East Biddulph is already too extended and saturated. Retains the Biddulph / Biddulph Moor separation and the open space between them. Stops the housing development that would have been highly visible from most of the rest of Biddulph. The vision for Biddulph must include developing the Town Centre which a more balanced geographic development supports. The by-pass greatly benefits developing on the West side, and looks like it was planned to support the expected housing allocations for Biddulph. Extending to the West past the current Town Boundary into the area bounded by Akemoor Lane, Brown Lees and the old rail track gives the opportunity to build organic housing developments instead of ribbon developments (lines of properties) making them more attractive, be in keeping with the rural nature that Biddulph Residents want to retain and enables the types of houses that potential buyers are looking for to be built. Only building on smaller and / or hemmed-in sites risks a repeat of what has happened on the Selectus site where houses have been built that no one wants to buy. Doing this across	Comments noted. See other tables for responses to the issues raised.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Biddulph may achieve the target numbers on the fewest sites possible but it would change the nature of the town in a very bad way and certainly not bring the desperately needed wealth into the town. Sympathetically developing this area to the West and using the less contentious parts provides the opportunity to achieve the required numbers with desirable properties and that will be close to the least number of existing dwellings and where there is space to include natural screening around the development and open spaces and natural screening within. ACCESS: There are already several existing routes across the old rail track, off / from Marsh Green Lane Mow Lane Station Road Wharf Road New Pool Road With 'large' developments, the Developer has an obligation to financially contribute to infrastructure improvements via the Community Infrastructure Levy, previously known as Section 106. Build nature sensitive access routes: bridge, tunnel, etc. to the Town side, widen lower Akesmoor Road to the West, etc. NATURE: Widen the natural screening of the old rail track by including a band along to the west which: Separates this development from the developments BD016, BD055, BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD108 & BD156 between the rail line and the by-pass. Makes a wider nature corridor along there. Adds to the visual and public open space in Biddulph. ADVANTAGES: It is a low laying area so will be a less obtrusive development, especially with natural screening. Enables pedestrian access to the Town Centre reducing car use, demand for increased car parking and pollution from vehicles. Provides close proximity to the amenities, e.g. the Health Centre and the planned late night Pharmacy. Gives the opportunity to include dwellings for the older residents where they will have close proximity to the Town Centre amenities. Reduces the likelihood of residents travelling north to Congleton or south to Stoke for their shopping, Close to the proposed Care Home in BD055 for those with elderly relatives and friends. Closer to the Halls Road sports grounds than potential developments to the south east of the town, reducing traffic volumes. It is able to accommodate the proposed new Primary School and is close enough for access by foot, so against the School being located to the south: Eliminates the need to travel by car. Could design for safe parent drop-off / pick-up. Reduces by-pass volumes. Eliminates needing to cross	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							the by-pass so safer for those on foot and reduces slowing of traffic. Therefore greatly improving safety for our vulnerable young children. The area being best located to maximise the positive impact of all the above in support of Town Centre regeneration and Town Council income generation into the future and beyond. The above demonstrating why this is the best Sustainable Location in achieving the goals of the Staffordshire Moorlands Sustainability Vision.	
PO532	Mrs C Picken				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It is pleasing that the views of the residents have been listened to and that the town boundary has not been extended eastwards, in the northern half of the town, which will help to preserve the independence and clear demarcation of the two separate communities of Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. I would like to say thankyou for taking sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 off the 'Preferred Options', as this area of Biddulph is already over-extended and saturated. Consideration should be given to the possibility of extending the town boundary on the west side of the town, through site BD116 and BD140, between the currently identified area of ADD03 and site BD063a, to allow for the possibility of further site allocations within this area. The vision for Biddulph must include developing the Town Centre, which a more balanced geographic development supports. The by-pass greatly benefits developing on the West side, and looks like it was planned to support the expected housing allocations for Biddulph.	Comments noted. The area you suggest is under investigation by the Council.
PO717	Mr Philip Beech				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I feel that the council has made a positive decision by deeming sites BD134, BD110, BD067a, BD067b and BD067c as constrained sites. In my opinion the areas to the North and East of Biddulph are already over populated, as previously reasoned and highlighted by the comments raised in the previous consultation. The inclusion of ADD03, and the utilisation of the area of land immediately to the west of the by-pass (BD076a, BD076, BD071 & BD071a, BD106, BD156, BD055, BD108), in my opinion, are a positive proposition for the Town as a whole, as this area is far more accessible from the main artery road running through Biddulph. The new proposed town boundary is good for Biddulph and its regeneration. Developing the 'proposed allocated sites' will have minimal impact on the existing residents and infrastructure, whilst meeting the future demands for development and regeneration. Use of these sites will give developers a 'clean sheet', whereby they can develop the areas in	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							an organic manner, and not be constrained by the presence of existing developments, and the issues that can arise when integrating developments old and new. I feel that the only type of development to be approved should be sympathetic, and the inclusion of ADD03 lends itself to this type of development. Also, the opportunity to expand the development in the coming years will already exist, without the need to search tirelessly for suitable sites, as is the case currently. In summary - I am very pleased with the proposed town boundary for Biddulph and commend the team involved with the project for their hard work.	
PO453	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support Pennine Way and Thames Drive sites BD067A, BD067B, BD067C, BD110 and BD134 being made constrained sites, thanks for removing the and listening to residents. We need to retain Biddulph/Biddulph Moor separation as North East Biddulph is too saturated with developments.	Comments noted.
PO639 PO658	Mrs Siobhan Perry Mr Andrew Perry				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	The boundary looks more balanced with regards to walking access for everyone to the town centre for shopping etc.... The removal of sites BD067A, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 to "constrained sites" is greatly appreciated. Building on these plots of land would have no real benefit to the growth of the town centre and decrease the open green space around Biddulph which makes it beautiful.	Comments noted.
PO844	Mrs Andrea Millington				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I agree with the local plan town boundary as it stands with extension to the west of the bypass which was clearly recommended in the core strategy. I believe that the green belt survey supports no further extension of the town boundary to the north east of the town and agree that BD067a,b,c, BD110 and BD134 should remain in greenbelt due to its proximity to Biddulph Moor, reducing the risk of the village and town becoming one entity. The town boundary has been extended so far to the north east it is becoming increasingly further away from the town centre and therefore the residents will be less likely to access the town as the routes out of north east of Biddulph encourage exit to Congleton and Stoke partly due to people being less likely to walk to town from such a distance.	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1045	Mr Nicholas Tavernor				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support the removal of sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134. These sites provide water catchment, which release water slowly into watercourses, as there has been increased flooding to properties on Smithy Lane since the development of the selectus site which would get much worse with development in these sites. They also and importantly retain the separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor and prevents a big band of highly visible development which starts to break peoples visual connection to landscape in which they live, especially considering the towns pride as a the garden town of Staffordshire. I do not think site BD062 should be developed as that provides natural water catchment, is a species rich site with valuable recreational use. BD076 & 76a could be developed with protection in place for the habitat and wildlife corridors on the north and east edges. BD071 & 71a could be developed with the provision that as a district value site the biodiverse habitat running along the steam following the bypass and contained within the hedgerows are retained and developed as part of the green infrastructure policy.	Comments noted. See Question 19 site table BD062, BD076 and BD076a and BD071 and 71a.
PO1057	Mr Robert Hurst				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It is visually obvious from the map that the proposed boundary results in a much better balanced development either side of the town centre, than would result from over development of the north east side. I understand that sites to the north east (BD67a-c, BD110 and BD134) have thankfully been made 'Constrained Sites'. Added to the current 'Uplands Mill' development those sites would have overloaded the access roads, the primary school does not have the capacity and 'school run' traffic already chaos. Pushing the development further up the hill towards Biddulph Moor would be detrimental to the special and rare moorlands countryside. As those sites retain considerable amounts of water from the hillside, any development would accelerate the runoff and probably overload the drainage system. The point in stating these 'objections' to those sites is by implication to support the boundary as now proposed in order to meet the housing requirement. To avoid making comment individually on each green belt amendment (Q17) and housing allocation (Q19), though in principle any green belt amendment should be resisted, in view of the above, I have no objection to the proposals.	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5228	Mrs I E Sefton				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It is reassuring to know that Pennine Way- Thames Drive sites have become constrained sites. Clearly SMDC has listened to local residents. This will also maintain the open space beyond Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. Where as possible it is important to protect Green Belt areas.	Comments noted.
PO5336	Mr D Heath				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It is good for Biddulph that Pennine Way etc. sites are taken off the north east of Biddulph is already too extended and saturated. Retains Biddulph Moor separation the other space between the stops the housing development that would have been highly visible from most off Biddulph,	Comments noted.
PO5277	Mrs S Purcell				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thank you for taking them off and for listening to the residents. Agree with all the comments.	Comments noted.
PO5302	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thank you for taking them off and for listening to the residents comments.	Comments noted.
PO5259	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thank you for listening to the residents and taking the off Thames Drive and Pennine Way (Most encouraging). Congleton Road from Mow Cop and looking across the Valley it seems vital to retain that green	Comments noted.
PO5250	Mrs J Sutton				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support the revised town boundary, I support the removal of the sites BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 a very sensible decision. I support the view that the north east of Biddulph maintains its present separation via the natural Green Belt corridor separating the town boundary from Biddulph Moor. I support the councils desire to improve the town centre. This is easily achievable by housing development to the west of the Biddulph Valley railway line.	Comments noted.
PO5076	Mr J Neate				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I strongly support the fact that the Pennine Way + Thames drive site are constrained sites.	Comments noted.
PO5077	Mrs L Neate				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134			

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5210	Mrs L McQuade				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thanks for taking residents comments on board.	Comments noted.
PO5234	Mrs P G Webb				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Good to know that the residents have been listened too!	Comments noted.
PO5235	Mrs P G Webb				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	All ready enough houses in the area.	Comments noted.
PO5345	Mr I Barber				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Already very saturated with housing and would be blight on the area, if built this area it would be a definite case of urban creep.	Comments noted.
PO5310	Mr A Picken				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It is pleasing to know that the town boundary has not been extended eastwards in the northern half of the town. This will help provide clear demarcation of the Biddulph, Biddulph Moor communities.	Comments noted.
PO5264	Mrs A Bridgette				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thank you for taking them off and for listening to the residents of Biddulph is already too extended and saturated so it's better that these sites are removed.	Comments noted.
PO9926	Mr J Wright				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Support the exclusion of sites BD067a-c, BD110 and BD134 from the plan.	Comments noted.
PO1004 6	Mr Philip Sutton				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support the proposed town boundary. I support the removal of sites BD067a-c, BD110 and BD134. I agree and support the decision that the north east of Biddulph maintains its natural corridor of land separating it from Biddulph Moor. Any development on this natural separation makes the town even more unbalanced. I more balanced geographic town centre is vital and I support the Council's desire to develop the town centre. This is easily achievable by the development of all the sites identified on the western side of the bypass.	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9790	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) I am against developments on green field sites. I support the removal of sites BD067a - c, BD110 and BD134 from the plan. This area should not be developed for the following reasons: Loss of separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor; Houses would be highly visible around the town; Loss of a natural floodplain; Loss of wildlife; Unstable land; loss of open space; Many empty houses exist in Biddulph already; and a Neighbourhood Plan is needed.	Comments noted.
PO9791	Mr Eric Biddle				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Do not agree with building on green field sites. Whilst brownfield sites exist they should be given priority. However, support the non-inclusions of sites BD067a-c, BD110 and BD134 for the following reasons: Constrained sites; this part of Biddulph has been saturated with houses and bungalows for many years; Houses on the old Selectus site are not selling - the site has not been developed sympathetically; The area would lose open space it needs; Biddulph Moor would be in danger of 'creep'; Wildlife would disappear; Land is unstable; Flood risk - no where to soak up water from Biddulph Moor; Visual intrusion of development; Many empty properties already exist in Biddulph; and a Neighbourhood Plan is needed.	Comments noted.
PO9643	Mr D Copeland				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Support changes made to the town boundary since the last plan was produced (Site Options 2015) which excludes BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134. Consider that town boundary should be extended to the west and south instead (see attached plan). Advantages would be: close and easy access to the town centre and facilities; close to Halls Road and less obtrusive (with screening); create access to the new development directly from the bypass; development here would not add to flooding problems experienced at present in Biddulph; and part of BD140 is an excellent place for a new primary school as we do not currently have a school on the west side of town.	Comments noted. The area you suggest is under investigation by the Council.
PO10203	Mr Stan Charlesworth				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Summary (see full attached response). Support the Biddulph development boundary. North Biddulph is surrounded by views and greenfields and close to Biddulph Grange support decision not to build new homes adjacent to Pennine Way and Thames Drive traffic generated from this development would have had an adverse impact.	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10216	Mr Stuart Nicholls				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	I support the removal of the sites off Pennine Way, Blackbird Way etc. from the plan. This decision is very important for a number of reasons including infrastructure, safety, wildlife and natural habitat preservation but also the retention of separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. Also, this area is already saturated by the recent building on the Uplands Mill site.	Comments noted.
PO9894	Mrs Janet Copeland				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Support the removal of sites BD067a-c, BD110 and BD134 from the plan. This will prevent urban creep between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. Develop brown field sites before any development on Green Belt land.	Comments noted.
PO9970	Ms Ashley Kirkham				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Summary (see full representation attached). Support making sites BD067b to BD134 'constrained sites'. Believe that the NE Biddulph is already developed enough and the separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor should be retained. Developing the west of the town would be better related to the town centre and the bypass and provides the opportunity to grow organically rather than ribbon development. There are several existing access points available.	Comments noted.
PO9962	Ms Claire Kirkham				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Thank you for listening to the residents by removing sites BD067a to BD134 from the plan. I believe north east Biddulph is already too extended and it is important to retain separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. Any new developments would be highly visible. Extending to the west past the current town boundary into the area bounded by Akemoor Lane, Brown Lees and the old rail track gives the opportunity to build organically instead of ribbon developments making them more attractive for buyers. Developing on the west would provide the opportunities to achieve the required number of properties using existing access points across the old rail track, Marsh Green Lane, Mow Lane, Station Road, Wharf Road and Newpool Road. Sympathetically developing on the west would naturally screen the old railway track by including a band on the west which has open spaces.	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10236	Mr Robert Kirkham				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Summary of response (see full response attached) Support the town development boundary to the north of Biddulph for the following reasons: the north of Biddulph is already too developed and not as close to the town centre as other sites retain the separation between Biddulph Moor and open views sites to the west of the bypass are in a better position to access the town centre and have better access points proving a logical location. It would be organic growth rather than ribbon development and the land is low lying	Comments noted.
PO10217	Mr Ian Evans				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Sites BD076A, BD076B, BD076C, BD110, BD134 have been made constrained sites and not shown [on Preferred Options], thank you. PENNINE WAY HAS HOUSING SATURATION AND WOULD ENCROACH ONTO THE SPACE BETWEEN BIDDULPH AND BIDDULPH MOOR.	Comments noted.
PO10208	Mrs J Cottrell				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary only) Support the town development boundary as it is now (north of Biddulph). There has been a large amount of housing over the last few years and the roads are extremely busy. Schools sewers etc are saturated.	Comments noted.
PO9852	Mr Gayle				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	It really seems a folly and injustice to the valley to build any higher up towards Biddulph Moor (i.e. BD067a-c, BD134, BD110). There certainly are lower sites within Biddulph giving people easier access to employment and route to Cheshire (Congleton Station) or to Hanley and Newcastle.	Comments noted.
PO10057	Mrs B Purton				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Support removal of BD067a-c, BD110 and BD134 from the plan. This will help to keep Biddulph and Biddulph Moor separate and prevent development which would be highly visible from most of the rest of Biddulph.	Comments noted.
PO9959	Miss M Underwood				BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134	Support	Pennine Way already suffers from the Uplands Mill development. The increase in traffic to Thames Drive and Pennine Way from further development would cause more pollution and ruin the estate. The Green Belt would be lost causing a loss of biodiversity and increasing the risk of flooding due to the removal of vegetation and trees only to be replaced with concrete.	Comments noted.
PO5142	Ms Karen Harding				BD067a-c	General comment	Thanks for listening to the local people of Biddulph removing in removing sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c from the development map. If this would have taken place this development would be visible from most of Biddulph and beyond.	Comments noted.
PO5148	Ms Melissa Harding				BD067a-c	General comment	I am glad that you have taken the proposed sites of BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, from the development maps. This site developed Biddulph further from the	Comments noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							town centre and could have been visible from most parts of Biddulph, thank you.	
PO5120	Ms Lynne Evans				BD067a-c	General comment	I would heartedly thank those involved in making the area a constrained site. I concur that this area surrounding Pennine Way is better removed from possible building as this would blight the existing developments.	Comments noted.
PO5152	Mrs P Alcock				BD067a-c	General comment	I am grateful you have taken time to listen to the local people of Biddulph and decided not to build on plots BD067a, BD067b, and BD067c north east of Biddulph sites have already had a lot of building and to the west gives a Biddulph a better balance. It also keeps Biddulph Moor separate.	Comments noted.
PO5159	Mr N McQuade				BD067a-c	General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comments noted.
PO5134	Mr Gary Harding				BD067a-c	General comment	Thank you taking the time to listen to the residents and taking the time plots BD067a, BD067c off the current maps. North east Biddulph sites have already been developed. This keeps the Biddulph, Biddulph Moor separation. Building to the west gives Biddulph a better balance.	Comments noted.
PO5155	Mrs C. Nicholls				BD067a-c, BD110, BD134	General comment	I support the new decision to the sites off Pennine Way, Black Bird Way etc. have now been made constrained sites, this is important in many ways including health and safety. Infrastructure etc. but also retains the separation between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. I believe that other areas could be classified for building + would not impact on residents these are land off Childerplay Road + the Old Victoria Colliery.	Comments noted. See responses to Question 19 for the Council's position on the sites you have suggested.
PO9775	Mr M Barlow				BD067a-c, BD110, BD134	Object	It was always Pennine Way as the roads are wide and the cul-de-sacs provide access to the sites. As for joining up to Biddulph Moor, Park Lane is already joined up to Biddulph Moor. Or could put a few less houses there, the site is big enough to take a lot of houses.	These sites have been removed from the plan as the Council's Green Belt Review considers that they are not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO1087	Mrs Valerie Austin				BD068	Object	Object to BD068.	Comments noted.
PO975	Mr Peter Turner				BD068	Object	BD068 The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills	Refer to Question 19 site table BD068.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							and pollutes private properties (experienced by 34, 36 and 38 Essex Drive). Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. 1. “The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 2. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). 3. This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and the Environment Agency were forced to clear the pollution (Environment Agency staff (identified by uniforms) in Biddulph Brook witnessed by residents). 4. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities & SMDC to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. It contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: “The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is “appropriate for its location” in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 6. The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17,000 residents. The population of Biddulph as at 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of 885 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							facility. This will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the CIL. 7. Email received from United Utilities by myself on 8/6/16 states, "We have held a recent discussion with officers at the local planning authority regarding the emerging development plan and specifically discussed the possibility of new housing near to the wastewater treatment works. In undertaking an assessment of which sites are most suitable, we feel that it is appropriate to highlight to local planning authorities the proximity of sites near to wastewater treatment works. We have explained that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them." Therefore, the utility provider advises against releasing development land close to the water treatment works. Evidence of best practice shows waste treatment works not recommended for close boundary development. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed..."will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk..." The site is in Flood Zone 2 Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the nearby residences as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. Neither the distributor road (Marsh Green Road) nor the feeder roads (Portland Drive) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are at least two pinch points on Marsh Green Road which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Marsh Green Road is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							no scope for the required improvements. The feeder road is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – measuring less than 8m (Standard = 10m) The feeder road is below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Marsh Green Road) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.3m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Portland Drive and the site off Marsh Green Road is restricted from both directions by a very tight bend and a road narrowing pinch point a maximum width of 5.4m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Marsh Green Road with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) due to the incline of the approach to the junction and tree line obstructions. Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “ Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development.” This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. Improvement works to the adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development.	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9023	Mr & Mrs Weaver				BD069	Support	HOUSING LAND, BIDDULPH – REF: BD069 - FORMER KNYPERSLEY HALL GARDEN CENTRE We write in support of the proposed allocation of the above brownfield, former garden centre site for residential development, inclusion within the town boundary for Biddulph and removal from the Green Belt. We write as owners of the site since 2003. The site has been in our family since 1940s when our family moved to Biddulph. In writing this letter we have taken advice from town planning consultants and have reviewed the consultation documents available on the Council's website. The following sections of this letter establish our reasons for supporting the proposed allocation of this site for residential development, including within the town boundary and its removal from the green belt. Please take this letter as a formal response to the Site Allocations Preferred Options consultation in respect of the site and Question 15, 17 and 19 in particular. The Site and Surroundings The site extends to approximately 1.02 hectares (2.5 acres). The land is shown on the plan attached at Appendix 1 (Ref. SF498873). The site is approximately one kilometre to the southwest of Biddulph town centre, which contains a variety of shops and facilities including a library and leisure centre. The land is bounded, to the north, by Orme Road, beyond which is Biddulph High School. To the south of the site is the Mill Hays Playing Fields. To the east and west of the site are primarily residential areas. To the south west of the site is a Knypersley Hall which is a Grade II* listed building. The site is a brownfield site which comprises of a former garden centre which was in operation from the late 1960s to 2003. The site is partly covered by greenhouses, other garden centre buildings (as shown on the enclosed photograph) and extensive areas of hard standing. The buildings on site have become dilapidated and have fallen into a state of disrepair following the closure of the Garden Centre in 2003. There are also a number of trees located along the site boundaries. The Principle of Development The Council's adopted Core Strategy (March 2014) identifies a need for 6,000 dwellings in the District between 2006 and 2026. The Core Strategy commits to undertaking an early review to cover the period 2016 – 2031 to ensure that future provision will continue to meet objectively assessed needs. It also states that the Council will seek to enhance the role of Biddulph as a significant service centre and improve	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 site table BD069.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							the local housing market by increasing the range of houses and allocating deliverable housing sites within the urban area and, on land adjacent to the urban area. Policy SS5B of the Core Strategy states that sites identified adjacent to the urban area of Biddulph shall be in locations which relate well to the urban area, can be assimilated into the landscape and would help secure infrastructure improvements. The supporting text to Policy SS5B states that due to the extent of green belt around the town, opportunities for peripheral expansion are limited. Therefore, it establishes that in order to meet the longer-term needs of the town, some development will be required in the green belt. It states that up to 2026 there will be a need for a minimum of 813 dwellings in Biddulph, of which land for around 200 dwellings would need to be identified in the green belt. Policy SS5B, therefore, states that the allocation of small urban extension sites will require a comprehensive review of the green belt boundary around Biddulph to accommodate the new dwellings through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and an early review of the Core Strategy. We understand that the Council has recently reviewed the position in relation to local housing need accounting for the latest Government household projections, new population and employment data. The Council's updated Housing Need report, from January 2016, concludes that the housing need for the District is between 250 to 440 homes per year between 2012 and 2031. Therefore the Council's Preferred Options document proposes an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year up to 2031. In relation to Biddulph it identifies a requirement for 1196 new dwellings (855 net) during the plan period to 2031. Therefore, we support the general growth strategy for the District and the focus on the delivery of the majority of housing and employment in the main towns, including Biddulph. We also support the proposed allocation of the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site, within the town boundary, for residential development to help contribute towards meeting the housing needs for Biddulph, for the following reasons. We understand that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that the fundamental objective of Green Belt policy, as established in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is to prevent urban sprawl. Paragraph 79 establishes that the essential	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							characteristics of Green Belts are their “openness” and “permanence”. However, by virtue of the site’s former use as a Garden Centre and the built structures on the site, including various garden centre buildings and green houses, it is considered that the brownfield site does not effectively serve or perform the five purposes or functions of the Green Belt established in paragraph 80 of the NPPF: “ to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. ” Moreover, the edge of the site is well defined and visually contained by the existing trees and soft landscaping which are located along its boundaries. The trees and change in levels at the site boundary sever the site from the green belt to the south, in physical and visual terms. This results in the site becoming a pocket of brownfield land that is visually isolated from the main area of green belt to the south. Therefore, development of the garden centre site would result in no visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield land, such as the garden centre site, which would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. By virtue of the visual containment of the site it is considered that the redevelopment of this brownfield site for housing would not have any greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or its function and would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The land to the south of the site is not in agricultural use and is the Mill Hayes Playing Fields, which are used by Biddulph High School. It is considered that the northern boundary of the playing fields would provide a more appropriate, clear, defensible boundary for the green belt along a physical feature or use which is readily recognisable and likely to remain permanent in line with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Moreover, we note that the Council’s Green Belt Assessment, undertaken by Amec Foster Wheeler, in November 2015, confirms that the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site makes a ‘limited’	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							contribution to the purposes and function of the green belt, is “ potentially suitable ” for removal from the green belt and comprises: “ Previously developed land with reasonably strong outer boundaries and which would create a logical extension to the current settlement envelope. ” We also note that the Council recognises, in their Options Site Assessment document (which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document), that in order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need to be adjusted as there are insufficient sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate Biddulph’s housing requirement to 2031. In proposing the site as a preferred option for removal from the Green Belt and residential development the Council clearly considers that the site is in a sustainable location that is contiguous with the neighbouring residential area that surrounds the site to the north, east and west. The Council clearly agrees with our view that the site is in an accessible location with good levels of accessibility to range of facilities on foot and by public transport. This is confirmed by the Council’s site assessment which states that the site is well related to the residential area and is close to Biddulph High School and other facilities. Moreover, there are several bus stops in close proximity to the site. These are located on Park Lane and Mayfields Road (less than 300 metres walking distance from the site). The bus stops are served by a number of bus routes which provide access to the various shops, facilities and employment in Biddulph Town Centre and further afield to areas including Congleton, Newcastle and Hanley. As stated previously, the site is brownfield land and contains various garden centre buildings and greenhouses. Unfortunately, since the closure of the garden centre in 2003, these buildings have fallen into disrepair. The site has also been the target of both vandalism and arson. Therefore, it considered that the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for residential development would enable a viable use for the site and provide the opportunity for the existing dilapidated structures on the site to be replaced by a viable, secure and efficient use of the land for residential development, which would contribute towards meeting the identified housing needs for Biddulph. Given the sustainable location of the site and its accessibility to services and facilities in the	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							town centre it is also anticipated that the site could make an appropriate contribution to meeting affordable housing needs in the district. The site is currently contained by security fencing due to the issues surrounding vandalism and arson. This gives the site an industrial appearance to dwellings surrounding the site. It is considered that the development of the site would also, therefore, provide the opportunity to improve the appearance and security of the site for residents living nearby. Technical Constraints It is understood that a suitable access to the site could be provided from Orme Road. Moreover, the development of the site would offer the potential opportunity for associated improvements to the 'un-adopted' Orme Road by a potential developer. Given the former use of the site as a garden centre is it not anticipated that there would be any issue or constraints to development in terms of ground conditions or contamination on the site. It is also understood that, given the former use of the site, and its location contiguous with the settlement boundary and nearby residential development, the site could be easily linked to mains services. The site is also fairly flat and there are no evident building constraints. According to the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. at low risk of flooding with less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding). According to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) residential development is a "more vulnerable" use to flooding. The NPPG confirms that residential development would be considered an appropriate use in Flood Zone 1. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015) also confirms that the site is in Flood Zone 1 at low risk of flooding. However, we note that there appears to be a minor error in the Options Site Assessment document, which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document, which suggests that the site is located within a flood zone. There are number of trees located within the site. However, the majority are located towards the site boundaries. Therefore, it is considered that the majority of the quality existing trees on the site could be effectively incorporated in to the design and layout of the site at a later stage. Moreover, the site is not subject to any designations relating to the conservation of ecology or biodiversity. Although the site is located adjacent to	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Knypersley Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building, as stated in the Council's Site Assessment, the site is secluded and separated from Knypersely Hall by the adjacent lake and a significant number of trees and landscaping and falls outside the curtilage of the Listed Building. Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site for approximately 30 dwellings would not result in any significant impact on the designated heritage asset or its setting, subject to appropriate design. We understand that the Council is currently commissioning a heritage impact assessment, in conjunction with Heritage England, for all the sites selected as Preferred Options allocations and we look forward to reviewing the outcome of this in assessment in due course. We are not aware of any technical constraints that would prevent development of the site for housing. However, should the Council require any further technical information to consider or support the suitability of the site for residential redevelopment and removal from the Green Belt we would be willing to investigate this further and provide any information where possible. Capacity and Deliverability The site is approximately 1 hectare in area. It is assumed that it could be developed at a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare, given its rural location. Therefore, giving an indicative site capacity of 30 dwellings. This is reflected in the Preferred Options document which indicates that the Council agrees that the site is capable of delivering circa. 30 dwellings. The site is immediately available for residential development. Therefore, assuming that development of the site could commence within two years of the allocation of the site (in the Council's Site Allocations Document which is expected to be formally adopted in 2017), following the grant of planning permission, we anticipate that the total number of dwellings would be constructed and delivered within a further year. Conclusions We trust that our responses above provide sufficient confirmation of our support for the allocation of the site in the Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), its deliverability and its possible contribution to the Council's housing delivery in the short-term, given the identified shortage of housing in the District.	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO869	Mr Jordan Kirkham				BD076 & BD076a	Object	I object to the proposed development of the site reference BD076 & BD076A on the following grounds: The traffic situation off Dorset Drive is currently a nightmare and take you 15mins to turn onto the bypass so with the additional development you would have no chance with the additional traffic. There is only one route into and out of Biddulph and the slightest drop of snow the bypass grinds to a halt and with additional retail traffic the whole road will become even more gridlocked making it even more impossible. Biddulph should be encouraging businesses to be developed within the town centre on the high street and not in out of town shopping complexes. The high street in Biddulph is completely dead therefore the council should be focusing its efforts on filling the empty shop units on the high street as its priority. The retail units outside of Sainsburys have been left empty since the date it was built as well as the surrounding units on the high street. The council should be trying to encourage footfall onto the high street and not outside retail developments.	Refer to Question 19 site table BD076 / BD076a.
PO5040	Mr G Boulton				BD108	Support	BD108 – I support this site	Comment noted.
PO280	Mrs Judith Cottrell				General	General comment	The town boundary should NOT be extended to incorporate ANY green belt in the Biddulph Area.	Refer to Question 17.
PO644	Ms Alison Conybeare				General	General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Comments noted.
PO5200	Mr Peter Brittain				General	General comment	Thank you for your actions.	Comments noted.
PO5093 PO5094	Mr J Neate Mrs L Neate				General	General comment	All the advantages should be explored and approved.	Comments noted.
PO138	Mr Carl Webb				General	Object	I believe the proposed boundary is not good for the town and people of Biddulph as it will harm the quality of life here. Views will be lost, pressure on infrastructure will increase, congestion will increase and wild life will be lost.	Comments noted.
PO628	Mrs Amanda Reed				General	Object	Not enough consultation with Biddulph residents as a whole to agree a forward plan.	Comments noted.
PO958	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				General	Object	The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy does not exist. It has not been used to inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and has consequently not established appropriate objectives and targets. It has consequently not mapped any integrated networks. This site needs protection from development and the Phase 1 Habitat information should be used to guide decision making.	A Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy will be published alongside the next draft of the Local Plan.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4888	Mrs J Goodwin				General	Object	Biddulph is a beautiful little village lying in a valley surrounded by open countryside, wooded areas a little bit of heaven. Over the years I have seen quite a lot of changes and this beauty disappear. My family came to Biddulph from worn torn Manchester when I was 3 and half years old. We lived in Gillow Heath what a lovely place it was. Now I despair when I go to Gillow Heath how it has been ravaged by continuous housing estates on all those lovely open fields have disappeared houses built on the selectus site like little boxes that are not selling. Biddulph before all our beautiful countryside is lost forever to the generations to come.	Comments noted.
PO5219	Mr I Seabridge				General	Support	Essential to maintain character of the area with a definitive open area space – ‘land boundary’ Existing road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate additional demand. Highways linkages and access road/egress poor. Any junction improvement at the Biddulph Road/Woodhouse Road priority junction will have an unfavourable impact on the character of the area.	Comments noted.
PO68	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				Green Belt	Object	We do not think that the town boundaries should be extended into green belt land as the government clearly states that green belt land will be protected	Comments noted.
PO607	Mrs Ellen Faulkner				Green Belt	Object	Not happy with any housing in the green belt.	Refer to Question 17.
PO559	Mrs Angela Turner				Green Belt	Object	Minimal land should be moved into the boundary from the Green Belt. Where other towns have land not classed as Green Belt, this should be prioritised before changing the status of Green Belt across the district.	Refer to Question 17.
PO913	Mr Robert Stockley				Green Belt	Object	Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing	Refer to Question 17.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO923	Mrs Elaine Stockley				Green Belt	Object	places for people and for nature long into the future. Green Belt: Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing places for people and for nature long into the future. Neighbourhood plans: Under the Government’s pledges, local people are to have more control over the planning of their neighbourhoods and the protection of Green Belt areas. The development of Neighbourhood Plans is there to give more power to local allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their area and that local people should have the final say on developments in their town. Our objections: According to the “Local Development Framework” document, sustainable development means “A better quality of life for everybody now and in the future”. Why do we need all these extra houses in Biddulph, when there are so many empty properties in the town. These extra houses will put great pressure on the infrastructure - Medical centres, the sewerage system (already overloaded from current residents and the many visitors to Biddulph Grange Gardens, the Country Park, Biddulph Valley Way, Sports facilities, town centre etc..) and the quality of life for residents through increased congestion and pollution. We are astounded that you are considering a plan for houses and a school on the Green Belt land around Akesmore Lane. We have been told that this Green Belt land has been a last minute amendment to the plan, which suggests that you are attempting to deceive people and go against all the principles of Neighbourhood planning. What are the reasons for adding Akesmore Lane to the plan, Biddulph is known as the Garden	Refer to Question 17.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							town of Staffordshire and yet you are willing to deprive local people and visitors of the beautiful countryside on the boundary of the town, which many people enjoy along the Biddulph Valley Way. You are prepared to disturb the wonderful bird/animal life and nature, which is in abundance there. Has an independent ecological survey been undertaken for this site to show the projected effect of water courses, will life (ironically Akesmore Lane has breeding curlews and lapwings (curlews being the bird shown on the SMDC logo!!) If you check old Ordinance Survey maps, you will see that this area used to be called "Lapwing fields". You are prepared to locate housing and a school next to the White Cottage, a very rare example of a Staffordshire thatched dwelling and Grade 1 listed. We have been informed at a recent resident's meeting that Staffordshire Moorlands District Offices are ignoring objections and ideas from our local Biddulph councillors and riding rough-shod over local people's wishes, going against all the principles of Neighbourhood plans. We are also very concerned that objections raised to the plan have so far not been uploaded to the relevant website - is this a ruse on your part to discourage people from making their objections, as well as making the website extremely difficult to locate from the main SMDC site? We believe that the Green Belt area proposed is unsuitable for building purposes, due to the many drift mines and the level of flooding over the last few years. Has there been a technical survey of flooding control in this area? There are extensive Brownfield sites in Biddulph and empty properties, which could be used rather than encroaching onto the Green Belt areas of the town. For example, the Victoria Colliery site has had millions spent on it (presumably from residents' council tax/income tax), so that it could be developed, so surely this would be an ideal option, meeting the government's commitment to prioritise Brownfield development and the aims of Neighbourhood planning. Another Brownfield site might be the Childerplay area, as well as other sites in the town, such as Whally Street, Singer Street, Cross Street, the ground behind the Leisure Centre (for the school), Caravan storage area, behind Chell's Yard. If we are not vigilant, we will be allowing our generation to spoil these Green Belt areas for generations to come. It is a terrible plan, badly presented, unscrutinised and rushed through - please stop now	

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							and think what you are doing. Above all, please listen to local people and adhere to the principles of Neighbourhood plans and the Government's commitment to Green Belt areas.	
PO4978	Mrs L Goodwin				Green Belt	Object	Essentially the town boundary should remain "as is", Green Belt was designed as such for a reason i.e. not to build upon.	Refer to Question 17.
PO151 PO158	Mrs Beverley Webb Mr Barrington Webb				Green Belt / Other Suggested Sites	Object	The town boundary should not be extended to include green belt for proposed housing until all Brownfield sites have been used for development. All Brownfield sites should be used before encroachment on to greenbelt e.g. From roundabout at the bottom of Thames Drive to Sainsburys taking in – Builders Merchants, Whalley Street Mill, Stringers Street Mill, Station Road Mill. The old dye works on Congleton Road, also City Bank Mill and Old Fireclay Pottery in Mow Lane.	Refer to Question 17 and Question 21 'Other Suggested Sites'.
PO1022 4	Mr R Hart				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Response form submitted [attached]: THE TOWN BOUNDARY SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED INTO GREENBELT UNTIL..BROWNFIELD SITES NEED TO BE ALL USED..TO INCLUDE MILLS ON STATION ROAD, WHALLEY STREET, STRINGER STREET, CITY BANK MILL.	Refer to Question 21 'Other Suggested Sites'.
PO5085 PO5084	Mr J Neate Mrs L Neate				Town Centre	Support	Development the Biddulph Town Centre will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	Comment noted.
PO5239	Mrs P G Webb				Town Centre	Support	The town centre developments needed many more shops would be very welcomed.	Comment noted.
PO5135	Mr Gary Harding				West Side	General comment	Biddulph bypass benefits Biddulph building on the west side.	Comment noted.
PO5140	Mr Gary Harding				West Side	General comment	Access to the sites west of Biddulph can be from Marsh Green Road, Mow Lane, Station Road, New Pool Road,	Comment noted.
PO5151	Ms Karen Harding				West Side	General comment	Again these sites give more balance to Biddulph. As a general comment the west side of Biddulph is flatter and would be more inconspicuous. This could be planned better for Biddulph future with the trees and the shrubbery hiding the development. The closeness of the bypass gives a quick access route to work. There are also good and plenty of access routes onto this development site.	Comment noted.
PO5180 PO5188	Mr J. Denton Mrs A Denton				West Side	General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comment noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5184 PO5192	Mr J. Denton Mrs A Denton				West Side West Side	General comment	Sympathetically developing the area to the west will provided space without intruding on existing properties. Pedestrian access to the town centre would be a big advantage as well as reduction in vehicle use and therefore lead to car parking reductions. Facilities such as the health centre, the local shops nearby may prove potential house purchases as well as Biddulph sector therefore building next to the west side of Biddulph will prove beneficial for the town regeneration.	Comment noted.
PO5126	Ms Lynne Evans				West Side	General comment	The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comment noted.
PO5130	Ms Lynne Evans				West Side	General comment	The old railway track has many more access routes that lend themselves to making developments here far easier, this area would avoid the problems experienced around the new uplands mill developments, with its squeezed together look and unattractive outcome,	Comment noted.
PO96	Mr Graham Vawdrey					Object	This development would cause an increase in traffic movements above and beyond the capacity of Halls Road and Station Road (already excessive) .Plus it would create a negative outlook for existing properties on the West side of Biddulph.	Comment noted.
PO4861	Mr Chris Millington				West Side	Object	Town Boundary should extend to a west and south of the town centre of Biddulph, North East already saturated and recent development at North East unable to attract buyers.	Comment noted.
PO9897	Mrs Janet Copeland				West Side	Object	Town boundary should be extended to the west and south so that access to the town is made easier. This would also encourage people to shop locally and to use the town's facilities.	Comment noted.
PO301	Mr Russell Picken				West Side	Support	It is pleasing that the town boundary has not been extended eastwards in the northern half of the town, which will help to preserve the independence and clear demarcation of the two separate communities of Biddulph and Biddulph Moor. Consideration should be given to the possibility of extending the town boundary on the west side of the town, through site BD116 and BD140, between the currently identified area of ADD03 and site BD063a, to allow for the possibility of further site allocations within this area.	Comment noted. The Council is investigating the area you have suggested.
PO5143	Ms Karen Harding				West Side	Support	If Biddulph needs to be developed it should be from the town centre out to the west. The bypass would also serve this area well.	Comment noted.
PO5116	LC Millington				West Side	Support	I support the latest town boundary in its changes/from last proposal) removing expansion to the east and adding areas to the west. The town is already lop sided enough.	Comment noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5344	Mr D Heath				West Side	Support	The west side of the bypass lends to the better development to support the town.	Comment noted.
PO5346	Mr I Barber				West Side	Support	Building to the west would also appear to be the most sensible. It would be the most attractive for the town, and would be less intrusive. Closer to the town centre amenities and be the access from the by-pass and several other parts.	Comment noted.
PO10207	Mrs Julia Hackney				West Side	Support	Proposed town boundary is positioning the new homes closer to a stronger road infrastructure ie the bypass. This could mean less traffic in residential area.	Comment noted.
PO243	Mr Robert Stockley					Object	Erosion of the Green belt will mean the end of the Biddulph Valley, and once that erosion starts there will be no stopping the development further into the green belt. The Biddulph Valley is a beautiful place to live, and if development continues up the green belt, we will no longer have a beautiful lovely place to live. The planners in Leek have had to be cajoled into even visiting Biddulph, and have picked the locations from two dimensional plans. The Victoria Colliery site was a complete surprise to the planners, and they weren't aware of the potential, or the cooperation with Newcastle BC who also want to build on the boundary. We need some joined up thinking here, not just sitting in offices miles away from the locations in question. We need to include the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road sites in the plan. This will give alternative locations for the schools, and provide an alternative catchment for the kids who live on the extremities of Biddulph.	Refer to Question 21 'Other Suggested Sites'.
PO5050	Ms Philippa Swindells					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5625	Mrs B Ratcliffe					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5445	Ms Diane Copeland					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5591	Mr Lewis Williams					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5828	Mr Carl Mason					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5849	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5806	Mr Christopher Slater					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5683	Mr Jason Eardley					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5785	Mr Stephen Clowes					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5653	Mr K Davies					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5021	Mrs B Milner					Object	i object to this site	Comment noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5022	Mr F Moorhouse					Object	yes i object	Comment noted.
PO5030	Mr G Boulton					Object	I have objections to this site being used for housing allocations/devlepmnt within Biddulph? yes	Comment noted.
PO5532	Mrs M Moffatt					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5675	Mrs M Brindley					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5765	Mr E Pearl					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5571	Mrs S Wilshaw					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5547	Mr R Wilshaw					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5380	Mrs S Harper					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5396	Mr G Harper					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5606	Mr A Barbeard					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO4891	Mrs K Hallam					Object	object	Comment noted.
PO4892	Mrs K Hallam					Object	i think the new site should be included in the new town boundary - no	Comment noted.
PO5507	Mrs C Drew					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5513	Mr N Moxon					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5225	Mr I Seabridge					Object	Disagree 'pie in the sky?'	Comment noted.
PO5491	Mr M Cook					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5410	Mrs L Cook					Object	l object	Comment noted.
PO5458	Mrs J Moxon					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5704	Mrs D Whalley					Object	l object	Comment noted.
PO5359	Mr S Leese					Object	I have objections to this site being included into the new town boundary - Yes	Comment noted.
PO5360	Mr S Leese					Object	I think this site should be included in the new town boundary? No	Comment noted.
PO5887	Mrs B Bainbridge					Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO266	Mr Christopher Hall					Support		Comment noted.
PO467	Mrs Jean Wrench					Support	Agree with comments stated.	Comment noted.
PO774	Mrs Jayne Beech					Support	I believe that the current proposed allocations are utilising land in a positive way, and the proposal to the town boundary is a good one. BD108, BD055, BD156, BD106, BD071, BD071a, BD076 and BD076a are, in my considered opinion, ideal for development. This can happen whilst causing minimum upset to existing property owners. These sites, if developed as one entity can be accessed easily from the existing Biddulph bypass and adjoining roads. These sites should be included within the proposed town boundary and should be developed. I support this proposal without reservation. Including AD003 will make good use of land which, although green belt	Comment noted.

Question 15 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support /Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							currently, forms a small part of the open space to the west of the town. Development here will have little visual impact on the western side of the valley due to the vast open space between it and Mow Cop/Congleton Edge. This location lends its self to a more satisfactory development than ones which may impact severely on existing developments. Also there is a positive opportunity to include a new school, which Biddulph desperately needs. I support the proposed town boundary for Biddulph.	
PO5281	Mrs S Purcell					Support	agree	Comment noted.
PO5626	Mrs B Ratcliffe					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5829	Mr Carl Mason					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5324	Mrs T. Cooper					Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5850	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5807	Mr Christopher Slater					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5630	M Mitchell					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5684	Mr Jason Eardley					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5786	Mr Stephen Clowes					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5654	Mr K Davies					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5020	Mrs B Milner					Support	i support this	Comment noted.
PO5031	Mr G Boulton					Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5767	Mr E Pearl					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5381	Mrs S Harper					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO4883	Mrs J Goodwin					Support	I support all the comments all the comments made on this issue. We should preserve our open spacing for future generations to enjoy.	Comment noted.
PO4884	Mrs J Goodwin					Support	All other comments I support fully.	Comment noted.
PO5168	Mr S Sneyd					Support	i support this	Comment noted.
PO5201	Miss F McQuade					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5707	Mrs D Whalley					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5332	Mr G Morris					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5314	Mr D Lovatt					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5328	Mrs R Bellwood					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5292	Mr S Findlow					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5888	Mrs B Bainbridge					Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO9666	Mrs P Hancock					Support	I support.	Comment noted.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO18	Mr Robert Moseley			ADD03	General comment	If you force through building on here including open space would break up the visual impact building in the greenbelt, keeping the wooded area at the Southern end and making a feature of the brook, similar to Dorset Drive.	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO237	Mr Robert Stockley			ADD03	Object	ADD03 is encroaching into the Green Belt, and will start the erosion of our beautiful valley. Even though the Victoria Colliery site is within some green belt, Newcastle Borough Council have agreed to merge a site on the boundary, which would benefit both councils. Together with Childerplay Lane, this has to be the preferred option.	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO534 PO592	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey			West of BVW	Support	The vision for Biddulph must include developing the Town Centre which a more balanced geographic development supports. The by-pass greatly benefits developing on the West side, and looks like it was planned to support the expected housing allocations for Biddulph. Extending to the West past the current Town Boundary into the area bounded by Akemoor Lane, Brown Lees and the old rail track gives the opportunity to build organic housing developments instead of ribbon developments (lines of properties) making them more attractive, be in keeping with the rural nature that Biddulph Residents want to retain and enables the types of houses that potential buyers are looking for to be built. Only building on smaller and / or hemmed-in sites risks a repeat of what has happened on the Selectus site where houses have been built that no one wants to buy. Doing this across Biddulph may achieve the target numbers on the fewest sites possible but it would change the nature of the town in a very bad way and certainly not bring the desperately needed wealth into the town. Sympathetically developing this area to the West and using the less contentious parts provides the opportunity to achieve the required numbers with desirable properties and that will be close to the least number of existing dwellings and where there is space to include natural screening around the development and open spaces and natural screening within. ACCESS: There are already several existing routes across the old rail track, off / from Marsh Green Lane Mow Lane Station Road Wharf Road New Pool Road With 'large' developments, the Developer has an obligation to financially contribute to infrastructure improvements via the Community Infrastructure Levy, previously known as Section 106. Build nature sensitive access routes: bridge, tunnel, etc. to the Town side, widen lower Akemoor Road to the West, etc. NATURE: Widen the natural screening of the old rail track by	Comments noted. This area is being considered by the Council.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						including a band along to the west which: Separates this development from the developments BD016, BD055, BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD108 & BD156 between the rail line and the by-pass. Makes a wider nature corridor along there. Adds to the visual and public open space in Biddulph. ADVANTAGES: It is a low laying area so will be a less obtrusive development, especially with natural screening. Enables pedestrian access to the Town Centre reducing car use, demand for increased car parking and pollution from vehicles. Provides close proximity to the amenities, e.g. the Health Centre and the planned late night Pharmacy. Gives the opportunity to include dwellings for the older residents where they will have close proximity to the Town Centre amenities. Reduces the likelihood of residents travelling north to Congleton or south to Stoke for their shopping, Close to the proposed Care Home in BD055 for those with elderly relatives and friends. Closer to the Halls Road sports grounds than potential developments to the south east of the town, reducing traffic volumes. It is able to accommodate the proposed new Primary School and is close enough for access by foot, so against the School being located to the south: Eliminates the need to travel by car. Could design for safe parent drop-off / pick-up. Reduces by-pass volumes. Eliminates needing to cross the by-pass so safer for those on foot and reduces slowing of traffic. Therefore, greatly improving safety for our vulnerable young children. The area being best located to maximise the positive impact of all the above in support of Town Centre regeneration and Town Council income generation into the future and beyond. The above demonstrating why this is the best Sustainable Location in achieving the goals of the Staffordshire Moorlands Sustainability Vision.	

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO753	Mrs Sharon Kirkham			ADD03	Object	Greenbelt should stay as greenbelt and not destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty. Would destroy the habitat for wild animals. Houses on Haydon Park devalued considerably since Sainsbury was built and would further devalue them. Fields and railway track are an excellent selling point. Dorset Drive would become a rat-run again, as it was when the bypass was being built. The small closes/cul-de-sacs on Haydon Park would be used for parking by parents going to the school. Trying to get off Dorset Drive at the Sainsburys roundabout in a morning is a nightmare now, never mind with potentially another 900 – 1200 cars (300 houses 3-4 cars each property). There is really only one way out in and out of Biddulph – gets gridlocked very easily. The Biddulph bypass only needs around 1cm snow in the winter to completely grind to a halt. The thatched cottage on Akesmore Lane is a listed building and the oldest property in Biddulph. Akesmore Lane is not adequate for more cars / housing / school, and dangerous for children to walk along to school. The railway track would go from a beautiful, tranquil place to walk, cycle, ride horses, to, basically, an alleyway between housing estates. Biddulph does not need another 300 extra houses – plenty of properties to buy and rent of all prices at the local estate agents. Also houses on the Uplands site didn't all sell and were turned over to social housing, which people from other areas moved in to fill . Biddulph does not need another school if they do not build more houses. If needed either extend existing ones or build on the former Meadows school site – James Bateman school still use the playing field there. Local amenities already under extreme pressure – ie, GP surgeries unable to recruit more doctors (had to recruit nurse/matron), and very difficult to get an appointment even now. The areas on the previous plans from meeting in July 2015, ie Gillow Heath, Pennine Way/Woodhouse Lane, Conway Road, have all been thrown out and basically pasted onto Akesmore Lane.	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO927	Mr Robert Stockley			ADD03	Object	Green Belt: Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing places for people and for nature long into the future. Neighbourhood plans: Under the Government’s pledges, local people are to have more control over the planning of their neighbourhoods and the protection of Green Belt areas. The development of Neighbourhood Plans is there to give more power to local allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their area and that local people should have the final say on developments in their town. Our objections: According to the “Local Development Framework” document, sustainable development means “A better quality of life for everybody now and in the future”. Why do we need all these extra houses in Biddulph, when there are so many empty properties in the town. These extra houses will put great pressure on the infrastructure - Medical centres, the sewerage system (already overloaded from current residents and the many visitors to Biddulph Grange Gardens, the Country Park, Biddulph Valley Way, Sports facilities, town centre etc..) and the quality of life for residents through increased congestion and pollution. We are astounded that you are considering a plan for houses and a school on the Green Belt land around Akesmore Lane. We have been told that this Green Belt land has been a last minute amendment to the plan, which suggests that you are attempting to deceive people and go against all the principles of Neighbourhood planning. What are the reasons for adding Akesmore Lane to the plan, Biddulph is known as the Garden town of Staffordshire and yet you are willing to deprive local people and visitors of the beautiful countryside on the boundary of the town, which many people enjoy along the Biddulph Valley Way. You are prepared to disturb the wonderful	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						bird/animal life and nature, which is in abundance there. Has an independent ecological survey been undertaken for this site to show the projected effect of water courses, will life (ironically Akesmore Lane has breeding curlews and lapwings (curlews being the bird shown on the SMDC logo!!) If you check old Ordinance Survey maps, you will see that this area used to be called "Lapwing fields". You are prepared to locate housing and a school next to the White Cottage, a very rare example of a Staffordshire thatched dwelling and Grade 1 listed. We have been informed at a recent resident's meeting that Staffordshire Moorlands District Offices are ignoring objections and ideas from our local Biddulph councillors and riding rough-shod over local people's wishes, going against all the principles of Neighbourhood plans. We are also very concerned that objections raised to the plan have so far not been uploaded to the relevant website - is this a ruse on your part to discourage people from making their objections, as well as making the website extremely difficult to locate from the main SMDC site? We believe that the Green Belt area proposed is unsuitable for building purposes, due to the many drift mines and the level of flooding over the last few years. Has there been a technical survey of flooding control in this area? There are extensive Brownfield sites in Biddulph and empty properties, which could be used rather than encroaching onto the Green Belt areas of the town. For example, the Victoria Colliery site has had millions spent on it (presumably from residents' council tax/income tax), so that it could be developed, so surely this would be an ideal option, meeting the government's commitment to prioritise Brownfield development and the aims of Neighbourhood planning. Another Brownfield site might be the Childerplay area, as well as other sites in the town, such as Whally Street, Singer Street, Cross Street, the ground behind the Leisure Centre (for the school), Caravan storage area, behind Chell's Yard. If we are not vigilant, we will be allowing our generation to spoil these Green Belt areas for generations to come. It is a terrible plan, badly presented, unscrutinised and rushed through - please stop now and think what you are doing. Above all, please listen to local people and adhere to the principles of Neighbourhood plans and the Government's commitment to Green Belt areas.	
PO10241	Mr R Hart			ADD03	Object	ADD03 should be kept as visual open space site.	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO146	Mr Carl Webb			All	Object	Object.	Comment noted.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO554	Mrs Angela Turner			All		The designation of Visual and Public Open Space is important in Biddulph. The SMDC Local Plan Policy C3 Sustainable Communities - Green Infrastructure [1] 8.7.16 and 8.7.17 references the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy which “ will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” This strategy does not exist either as a GIS set or other publically accessible form. In the light of this missing information, the evidence contained within the Phase 1 Habitat Survey must be acted upon, especially where sites are shown to have good links to the surrounding landscape. As SMDC are missing the evidence base that a Green Infrastructure Strategy would have provided (which would have strategically identified and linked such spaces) more work is need on this objective and time should be given for this to happen. Additional surveys should take place to better understand how these wildlife corridors link together and can eb enhanced and protected. All wildlife corridors identified in the Phase 1 Habitat surveys should be given a level of protection and it should be considered that Visual Open Space could be one such designation. These are mostly linear in function and thereby do not significantly impact on the surrounding wider land use. Along the West of the bypass (sites BD71 & 71a) the Phase 1 habitat survey identified a river margin which is well connected to the countryside and deserves protection. It is bounded by a number of mature trees which should similarly be protected as part of the landscape characer of this area. This would, in reality, impact on only a tiny proportion of this site which, in places is steep sided and would have minimal impact on the wider land use. The survey at BD062 identified the sites importantce due to its ability to connect the river and linear habitat of the Biddulph Valley Way. The presence of a wet meadow in this location demonstrates the sites current natural 'job' of retaining and slowing down surface run-off from the Biddulph Valley Way and the Long Valley estate before it runs off into the Biddulph Brook (the field increases the lag time into the river and helps to reduce flooding incidents). The survey at BD76 & 76a identified watercourses and a biodiverse north and eastern edge. The survey at BD106 and 156 identified species rich hedegrows. As the Green Infrastructure Strategy does not exist, this information should be used to start the process of mapping our wildlife corridors and protecting them where they have been	It is agreed that the designation of all types of open space is important. The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Land designated as Visual Open Space in the existing Local Plan (which is an old designation and not supported in current Government policy) has been assessed to determine whether it qualifies as Local Green Space (an NPPF compliant designation) and the Council will then include sites in the next consultation version of the plan for comments. A Draft version of the Council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy will be published alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan and comments will be invited.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						identified. Designation of parts of these sites (such as the river corridors) as Visual Open Space is a good starting point and shows that SMDC is giving equal weighting to environmental information in it's purpose of ensuring 'Sustainable Development.' There is already a precedent set for this on the Pennine Way estate and off Halls Road. Green Infrastructure has been shown to have a positive benefit in economic, social and environmental terms (DEFRA Guidance, RTP1). The RTP1 Briefing Paper on Green Infrastructure states: The NPPF requires local planning authorities to use the term green infrastructure. The NPPF definition of green infrastructure (p.52), states that it is "A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities." In the NPPF, the onus is on local planning authorities to plan positively for strategic networks of green infrastructure (Para. 114), and take account of the benefits of green infrastructure in reducing the risks posed by climate change (Para. 99). The wider benefits of green infrastructure beyond its contribution to ecological networks and climate change adaptation are also referenced. There is no evidence that SMDC are 'planning positively' for strategic networks of Green Infrastructure in Biddulph. The Green Infrastructure approach is vital for areas such as Biddulph where the landscape surrounding and running through the town forms one of its' greatest assets. Indeed, the SMDC Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 recognises this benefit: "Staffordshire Moorlands contains a wide range of existing and potential green infrastructure assets, which can benefit from a strategic approach to ensure adequate protection is given to key features, to identify areas where new linkages and assets need to be created and to guide and manage development which may impact on such areas. The Core Strategy recognises the cross cutting function that green infrastructure has, and the benefits of integrating green infrastructure with social and economic priorities, which will help contribute to the development of sustainable communities." I can see no evidence of this approach so far within the SMDC Local Plan site allocations process, contradicting the SMDC Core Strategy. Under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, SMDC has a duty to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. With the evidence base of the Green Infrastructure Strategy being non-existent SMDC have to understand and positively act on the findings of the Phase	

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						1 Habitat Survey and realise the significance of the findings in local and district terms. [1] SMDC Core Strategy 8.7.13 Green Infrastructure Policy C3. Pg.137 8.7.16 and 8.7.17	
PO2568	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England		All	Object	I note some of the open space designations are formal sports facilities (which is supported) but it is very important that all sports sites are captured otherwise those excluded will have lesser protection. I note that the Football Ground off Orchard Court/Grace Street for example is not designated whereas the cricket club site just to the north is - why? I also note that the playing fields associated with the secondary school are not designated – should they not be? It will be important to clarify what is designated and why (or why not) and to ensure all playing fields are clearly protected (as it is a defined function/use of open space), whether it is in Council ownership or not (Birchhall Playing Fields appears to be included?) so there is a consistent level of protect for all open space, whatever its use. This principle applies across ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS.	The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.
PO2862	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council		All	Object	In relation to the areas of Open Space identified throughout the site options document it is noted that all school playing fields have been categorised as open space, some in their entirety and others appear to only include certain parts. There is no definition in the plan as to what 'Open Space' constitutes or whether it needs to be accessible to the general public. As the Plan progresses it is unclear what policy restrictions may be imposed to such land. We therefore reserve our position on 'Open Space' at school fields and suggest that further discussion is required on whether the identification of school playing fields as 'Open Space' is required given the protection afforded to playing fields already through National Planning legislation and school premises legislation?	- Not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. - See response to Sport England.
PO7309	Ms Joan Walley			All	Support	I support the inclusion of designation of open spaces for formal and informal recreation, and the importance of designation of footpaths and the green corridor that is the former railway line.	Comments noted.
PO10219	Mr Stuart Nicholls			All	Support	It is important that all public open spaces and visual open spaces are retained for all Biddulph residents.	Comments noted.
PO1288	Justin Milward	Woodland Trust		All sites	Support	Support provision of Open Space in the Local Plan. (Further detail in the attached comments).	Comments noted.
PO5371 PO6287 PO6489	Mr S Leese Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe Mr Gilbert Bradley			BD004	Support	i support	This site is not included in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation Document due to uncertainty about its availability and an access issue which will be difficult to overcome.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6636	Mr Ronald Bailey						
PO6609	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO7389	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7332	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO7536	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs						
PO6788	Mrs A Jones						
PO6410	Mr P Squires						
PO5417	Mrs L Cook						
PO6083	Mr I Frisby						
PO6065	Mr R Blood						
PO5468	Mrs J Moxon						
PO6901	Mr M Mason						
PO6882	Mr G Mason						
PO6864	Mr A Copeland						
PO6119	Mrs J Frisby						
PO6396	Mr B Wilson						
PO6325	Ms S Wilson						
PO8271	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8512	Mrs Gillian Flannagan						
PO6243	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO8426	R Hutton						
PO8454	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO8493	Miss L Delves						
PO8389	Mr John James						
PO8095	Mr K Davies						
PO7809	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg						
PO7500	Mrs L Carter						
PO8731	Mr Stephen Willott						
PO8751	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8843	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO8824	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO7140	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7447	Mr K Flannagan						
PO8933	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8871	Mrs J.A. Bennett						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8687	Mrs Joan Draisey						
PO7894	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO7919	Mr J Swindell						
PO8666	Mr A Malbon						
PO8707	Mr R Willott						
PO8772	Mr J Whitehurst						
PO8787	Mr S Holdcroft						
PO8205	Mr D Smith						
PO7695	Mr J Shelly						
PO8557	Mr R Scales						
PO8114	Mr A Forrester						
PO7756	Mr R Bradbury						
PO8958	Mr C Goodwin						
PO5640	M Mitchell						
PO180	MR Kingsley Rowland						
PO7952	Mr A Lehepoo						
PO8081	Mrs V Jackson						
PO8576	Mrs J Sailes						
PO5598	MR LEWIS WILLIAMS						
PO5839	Mr Carl Mason						
PO5861	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO5740	Mrs Eileen Smith						
PO5694	Mr Jason Eardley						
PO6176	Mr and Mrs D Barclay						
PO5796	Mr Stephen Clowes						
PO6021	Mr P Price						
PO6003	Mrs L Price						
PO5667	Mr K Davies						
PO7066	Mr C Kisicki						
PO6589	Mrs Beverley Holding						
PO6566	Mr Jeffrey Leese						
PO6546	Mrs Ann James						
PO5645	M Mitchell						
PO5524	Mr N Moxon						
PO5499	Mr M Cook						
PO5482	Mrs L Cook						
PO5436	Mrs K Hallam						
PO6030	Mr T Barker						
PO5776	Mr E Pearl						
PO5582	Mrs S Wilshaw						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5561 PO5391 PO5407 PO7014 PO7044 PO6430 PO5053 PO5447 PO5400 PO5462 PO5493 PO5430	Mr R Wilshaw Mrs S Harper Mr G Harper Mrs D Stuttard Mr and Mrs B Carter Mr Paul Malkin Ms Philippa Swindells Ms Diane Copeland Mr G Harper Mrs J Moxon Mr M Cook Mrs K Hallam						
PO6221 PO6803 PO6469 PO6923 PO6697 PO6849 PO6100 PO6137 PO6156 PO5717 PO5755 PO5964 PO8371 PO8474 PO8150 PO8185 PO8054 PO8015 PO8032 PO7989 PO7974 PO7289 PO7230 PO7187 PO7168 PO7838 PO7121 PO7356 PO7261 PO7564	Mrs P Newton Mr M Owen Mr K Rowland Mrs J Brennan Mrs D Cook Mrs I Latta Mr D Cantrill Mrs J Collier Mr K Collier Mrs D Whalley Mr J Hammond Mr M Clews Mr and Mrs W Summerscales Mr B.W. Newton Ms Janet Lawton Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst Mr B Hyde Mr N Goode Mr K Parry Mrs A Brown Mrs C Hensor Mrs C Dale Mrs L Goodwin Mr A Nixon Mrs G Hall Miss L Siddorn Mrs A Cunliffe Mr E Hilditch Mr A Weston Mrs G Weston			BD004	Object	i object	Comment noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation Document.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7422	Mr J Banister						
PO8914	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO8595	Mrs R Knapper						
PO8224	Mrs P Kelly						
PO8239	Mr P Kelly						
PO7714	Mr D Bradbury						
PO7735	Mrs E Griffiths						
PO8970	Mrs P Hindmarsh						
PO8351	Mr N Mosson						
PO8331	Mrs S Bennett						
PO8290	Mr R Cook						
PO8537	Mr D Neal						
PO8637	Mr R Booth						
PO8617	Mrs M Booth						
PO7872	Mrs J Banister						
PO8405	Mr G Price						
PO8890	Mr M Clews						
PO6050	Mr Reg Grimwood						
PO6675	Mrs J M Slater						
PO6195	Mrs Alison Wickstead						
PO6824	Mr D Wickstead						
PO5616	Mr A Barbeard						
PO6957	Mr K Allen						
PO6377	Mrs K Chaddock						
PO6994	Mr R Lawton						
PO5066	Ms Philippa Swindells						
PO5817	Mr Christopher Slater						
PO5399	Mr G Harper						
PO5402	Mr G Harper						
PO5431	Mrs K Hallam						
PO5412	Mrs L Cook						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO576	Miss Louise Richardson			BD062	Object	The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded "... the site is not recommended for potential development ..." It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. " The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets." SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings). The site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey	Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the Species Rich Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area , where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is “ ... very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site.” This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. The local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built in 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space , protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. Three well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land. Provision of community enjoyment of countryside and open spaces is supported by the Commons Act 2006.	
PO959	Mr Alistair McLoughlin			BD062	Object	Object.	Comment noted.
PO964	Mr Christopher Goldstraw			BD062	Object	Do not built on site BD062. New houses should only be built where there is minimal environmental impact. Houses should not be built in such proximity works to a sewage works. Additionally, do not build on sites BD068 and BD087.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Tables BD062, BD068 and BD087.
PO4866	Mr Allan Knapper			BD062	Object	Consider that this site should remain included as a visual open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Tables BD062, BD068 and BD087.
PO5054	Ms Philippa Swindells			BD062	Object	i dont support this site	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Tables BD062, BD068 and BD087.
PO5003	Mr R Milner			BD062	Support	Consider that this site should remain included as a visual open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO5024	Mr F Moorhouse			BD062	Object	yes i support that this site should be included in the visual open space	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO5034	Mr G Boulton			BD062	Object	yes i support that this site should be included in the visual open space	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4896	Mrs K Hallam			BD062	Object	Consider that this site should be included as a visual open or public space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO9957	Mr C Lunt			BD062	Object	Consider this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO9987	Mr Ray Lloyd			BD062	Object	I think the site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO9954	Mr T Green			BD062	Object	I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD062.
PO152	Mrs Beverley Webb			BD068	Object	BD068 Should be regraded as a Visual Open space.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD068.
PO160	Mr Barrington Webb			BD068	Object	BD068 Should be regraded as a Visual Open space.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD068.
PO4895	Mrs K Hallam			BD068	Object	I think the site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD068.
PO5363	Mr S Leese			BD068	Object	I think the site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	Comments noted. Refer to Question 19 Table BD068.
PO5643	M Mitchell			BD071	Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5629	Mrs B Ratcliffe			BD102	Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5599	Mr Lewis Williams						
PO5840	Mr Carl Mason						
PO5862	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO5741	Mrs Eileen Smith						
PO5818	Mr Christopher Slater						
PO6051	Mr Reg Grimwood						
PO5695	Mr Jason Eardley						
PO6177	Mr and Mrs D Barclay						
PO5797	Mr Stephen Clowes						
PO6022	Mr P Price						
PO6004	Mrs L Price						
PO5668	Mr K Davies						
PO5028	Mr F Moorhouse						
PO7067	Mr C Kisicki						
PO6590	Mrs Beverley Holding						
PO6567	Mr Jeffrey Leese						
PO6547	Mrs Ann James						
PO6676	Mrs J M Slater						
PO6196	Mrs Alison Wickstead						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7045	Mr and Mrs B Carter						
PO6431	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO6825	Mr D Wickstead						
PO5777	Mr E Pearl						
PO5583	Mrs S Wilshaw						
PO5563	Mr R Wilshaw						
PO5392	Mrs S Harper						
PO5408	Mr G Harper						
PO5437	Mrs K Hallam						
PO6031	Mr T Barker						
PO6960	Mr K Allen						
PO7015	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO6378	Mrs K Chaddock						
PO6995	Mr R Lawton						
PO5525	Mr N Moxon						
PO5500	Mr M Cook						
PO5483	Mrs L Cook						
PO5418	Mrs L Cook						
PO5469	Mrs J Moxon						
PO6902	Mr M Mason						
PO6884	Mr G Mason						
PO6865	Mr A Copeland						
PO6084	Mr I Frisby						
PO6066	Mr R Blood						
PO6101	Mr D Cantrill						
PO6120	Mrs J Frisby						
PO6138	Mrs J Collier						
PO6157	Mr K Collier						
PO5756	Mr J Hammond						
PO5965	Mr M Clews						
PO5372	Mr S Leese						
PO6288	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO6490	Mr Gilbert Bradley						
PO6363	Mr V A Bainbridge						
PO6637	Mr Ronald Bailey						
PO6610	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO7390	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7333	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO7538	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs						
PO6789	Mrs A Jones						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6411	Mr P Squires						
PO6470	Mr K Rowland						
PO6924	Mrs J Brennan						
PO6698	Mrs D Cook						
PO6244	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO6397	Mr B Wilson						
PO6222	Mrs P Newton						
PO6326	Ms S Wilson						
PO8272	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8513	Mrs Gillian Flannagan						
PO8131	Ms Barbara Griffiths						
PO8427	R Hutton						
PO8370	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO8475	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO8455	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO8494	Miss L Delves						
PO8390	Mr John James						
PO8151	Ms Janet Lawton						
PO8186	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst						
PO8096	Mr K Davies						
PO7975	Mrs C Hensor						
PO7290	Mrs C Dale						
PO7231	Mrs L Goodwin						
PO7810	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg						
PO7122	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7357	Mr E Hilditch						
PO7501	Mrs L Carter						
PO7262	Mr A Weston						
PO7566	Mrs G Weston						
PO7141	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7449	Mr K Flannagan						
PO7423	Mr J Banister						
PO8732	mr Stephen Willott						
PO8752	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8844	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO8825	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8915	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe						
PO8934	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8872	Mrs J.A. Bennett						
PO8688	Mrs Joan Draisey						
PO7895	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO7920	Mr J Swindell						
PO8596	Mrs R Knapper						
PO8638	Mr R Booth						
PO8615	Mrs M Booth						
PO8667	Mr A Malbon						
PO8708	Mr R Willott						
PO8773	Mr J Whitehurst						
PO8206	Mr D Smith						
PO8291	Mr R Cook						
PO8538	Mr D Neal						
PO8558	Mr R Scales						
PO8577	Mrs J Sailes						
PO7873	Mrs J Banister						
PO8115	Mr A Forrester						
PO7757	Mr R Bradbury						
PO8406	Mr G Price						
PO7953	Mr A Lehepoo						
PO8082	Mrs V Jackson						
PO8891	Mr M Clews						
PO8959	Mr C Goodwin						
PO7696	Mr J Shelly						
PO7736	Mrs E Griffiths						
PO7798	Mr R Hindmarsh						
PO5646	M Mitchell			BD102	Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO5617	Mr A Barbeard						
PO5718	Mrs D Whalley						
PO6804	Mr M Owen						
PO8786	Mr S Holdcroft						
PO5067	Ms Philippa Swindells						
PO8055	Mr B Hyde						
PO8016	Mr N Goode						
PO8033	Mr K Parry						
PO7990	Mrs A Brown						
PO7188	Mr A Nixon						
PO7169	Mrs G Hall						
PO7839	Miss L Siddorn						
PO8225	Mrs P kelly						
PO8238	Mr P kelly						
PO7715	Mr D Bradbury						
PO8971	Mrs P						

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8352 PO8332	Hindmarsh Mr N Mosson Mrs S Bennett						
PO5641	M Mitchell			BD106	Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5642	M Mitchell			BD156	Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO468	Mrs Jean Wrench			Biddulph	Support	Agree with the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph.	Comment noted.
PO630	Mrs Amanda Reed			Biddulph	Object	Biddulph residents currently choose to live in this area due to the fact it has a semi rural feel and small town atmosphere the number of homes proposed will have a negative effect on the whole town.	Comment noted.
PO687	Mr Ian Turner			cycle path adjacent to akesmoor lane	Object	Appears that building adjacent to this well used public walkway. This will impact adversely on the views and the environment and ecology in this area	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO737	Mr Philip Beech			East of Biddulph	Support	I feel that the decision to make sites BD134, BD110, BD067a, BD067b & BD067c into constrained sites is a positive one. Development of this land would have created 'urban sprawl' encroaching on the village of Biddulph Moor, which isn't favourable. I'm happy that this natural separation is to be retained. I support the decision to deem them constrained.	Comment noted.
PO645	Ms Alison Conybeare			General	General comment	Please seek the local resident's views. These are the most important.	Comment noted.
PO5156	Mrs C. Nicholls			General comment	General comment	It is important for all Biddulph residents that they have public open spaces are retained.	Comment noted.
PO5229	Mrs I E Sefton			General comment	Support	To maintain many of our open spaces enables the attractive environmental of our town to be protected.	Comment noted.
PO5109	Mr Cottrell			General comment	General comment	More public spaces required.	Comment noted.
PO5160	Mr N McQuade			General comment	General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comment noted.
PO5211	Mrs L McQuade			General comment	Support	i support this	Comment noted.
PO5202	Miss F McQuade			General comment	Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO9972	Ms Ashley Kirkham			New site (West Biddulph)	Support	Sympathetically developing the west could achieve the desired number of houses close to the least number of existing properties where natural screening can be used around the development and open spaces within.	Comment noted. This area is being considered by the Council.
PO1341	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust		Newpool Meadows	Object	Newpool Meadows should be marked as Public Open Space.	A review of Public Open Space in the Staffordshire Moorlands is underway and this site will be assessed as part of it.

Question 16 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company /Org	Agent Name	Open Space	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO342	Miss Gemma Docksey			Route 55 / ADD03	General comment	Re. ADD03 Akemore Lane Route 55 runs through the whole of Biddulph. This area is used by many people and is part of the reason people from outside of the area come to enjoy our beautiful garden town. To build 300 potential homes and a school adjacent to Route 55 would deter people and reduce the money we receive from tourism. I understand that trees and hedges could be planted as a screen however you only need to look at other areas of the Route which back onto houses to see that fly tipping and litter is already an issue, this causes hazards to wildlife and detracts from the picturesque area we live in and spend out recreational time. I believe that Route 55 needs to be preserved and protected from over development, I see this being a big issue when it come to revenue the town receives from our tourism.	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO70	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths			Surrounding ADD03	Object	We think that the existing open space should remain and not be reduced by removal of green belt land	Refer to Question 19, Table ADD03.
PO302 PO533	Mr Russell Picken Mrs C Picken				General comment	If area ADD03 is to be used, maybe a strip of visual open space could be included between the development and the "Biddulph Valley Way". This would make the new housing development more appealing visually, both from within the development itself and when viewed from the "Biddulph Valley Way". Likewise, if areas within BD140 (to the south of ADD03) and BD116 were to be used, maybe a strip of visual open space could be included between the development and the "Biddulph Valley Way". This would make the new housing development more appealing visually, both from within the development itself and when viewed from the "Biddulph Valley Way".	Comments noted. A buffer zone between development and the Biddulph Valley way will be considered as part of the site layout if these areas are selected for development.
PO547	Mr Bill Hockey				Support	Developments need to be on sites that can include the provision for open spaces and not be so close together that potential residents are not put off from moving / buying there.	Comment noted.
PO848	Mrs Andrea Millington				General comment	I do not agree with some of the brownfield sites within the town centre being classed as visual open space when the majority of site allocations are using greenbelt rather than brownfield. Part of the aesthetic attraction of Biddulph is the open space surrounding the town boundary due to the mass of greenbelt surrounding the town, it is important to retain as much of this as possible as we are known as the garden town of Staffordshire and not just because of the Biddulph Grange.	Comments noted. None of the 'Visual Open Space' (VOS) sites shown on the map are brownfield – they are green spaces providing breaks between development.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO19	Mr Robert Moseley				ADD03	Object	The Old railway line has acted as a boundary for many years protecting the Greenbelt, once breached the gloves are off for building all the way up to the summit of the valley. No further encroachment up the valley sides should take place. We all have a duty to protect the green space for us and our children, a breach of this is a violation of that trust. Instead of building on this land, trees should be planted and made into a public space for all. This is not your land it belongs to us all. Stop the building into greenbelt and making a mockery of this legislation. It states in your introduction in "exceptional circumstance" should the greenbelt be built on this is not that, this is poor planning.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site ADD03 for release from the Green Belt. - If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. - The land is privately owned so is unlikely to become a public space.
PO33	Mr E Shaw				ADD03	Object	(Summary) Infrastructure The proposed development site does not have the infrastructure to support the amount of proposed housing by means of the road links as Akeshire Lane is a narrow country lane and resembles a modern day cart track due to the amount of surface water that runs off the hills from Mow Cop eventually in to three natural streams. The roads leading in to Station Road, Halls Road, Mow Lane etc cannot cope with a further amount of vehicles. A further 744 vehicles (assuming each proposed property has two vehicles) plus school traffic using the access roads of Station Road etc would not cope with the vast increase of traffic. Akeshire Lane does not have any other access other than from Wedgwood Lane which leads from the narrow Mow Lane. Akeshire Lane is a road leading to various farms which have a regular daily use of large tractors and HGV's for deliveries etc accessing the farms and therefore further cars etc using the local lanes themselves pose a danger for the new proposed residents. The residents of the any new proposed development may well work in the City of Stoke on Trent or need to access the A500 and M6 therefore they would travel South along Akeshire Lane, Towerhill Road etc and on through various nearby villages such as Newchapel, Harshead and therefore putting further pressure on very narrow busy side roads. Services There is a lack of services with the area of Akeshire Lane, there is no mains drainage or gas, with the water supply pressure being very low at my father's property at Moody Street Farm. The mains electric has to come from Knypersley. Wildlife The area has been	- National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers (including gas and electricity suppliers) is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - The Highway Authority has no difficulties with the principle of development in this location. Improvements needed to the road network as a result of development would need to be identified through a Transport Assessment. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							greenbelt for many years with very little development in the proposed ADD03 development area, and therefore wildlife has been able to flourish, with mature hedgerows and oak trees all the for birds, ducks and bats, natural habitat etc together with newts and water wild life with the three natural brooks and water courses. If a new development of housing and schools was permitted almost all the natural environment will be destroyed. History Located within the proposed site ADD03 is Biddulph's oldest house a large thatched cottage which is Listed standing in its own grounds - approximately 7 acres. The cottage is occupied and should be preserved for future generations. The area has a long standing mining history and therefore past mineworkings will have to be dealt with and further excavations may create further land stability issues for existing properties and residents. The area was effected by the Foot & Mouth disease in the 1960's and therefore concerns can be raised if past graves of the cattle were excavated. Farming The proposed development will have a very negative impact on the location with many local farmers struggling to make any form of a living from the land either as a dairy, beef or sheep farming. Most farmers and landowners have had to diversify significantly to rotate the land with various animals in order to make a living. Concerned about loss of view and impact on property prices.	drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed. • Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD03 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended]. • If the site is developed hedgerows would be retained within the scheme layout wherever possible. • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "There is one Grade II Listed Building within the site. The setting of the asset contributes to the overall significance of it and would need special regard for its preservation. Development would be highly likely to cause adverse effects to its setting. Therefore, any development should be restricted to the southern part of the site only and mitigation should include the use of vegetation screening to reduce adverse effects to its setting. Whilst the HEA states that zone BBHECZ 18 cannot absorb significant change, development to the south of the site would be a small change to the zone as a whole, and with appropriate development, this could be accommodated on the site (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site is suitable for development in heritage terms, subject to suitable masterplanning; if development is restricted to the southern part of the site only and with appropriate screening." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
								and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • It is not considered that development in this location would impact on the enjoyment of the route and long ranging views (e.g. to Mow Cop) and the wider countryside would remain. • Property values are not considered material in planning law.
PO39	Mrs Emma Hallen				ADD03	Object	Destruction of green belt land for housing would have a devastating effect on wildlife and habitats. The views of fields and hedgerows would be lost. The bridal path is widely used by a variety of people including families like ours which would not want to use this if it became a path through a housing estate. The consultation evening has been poorly advertised and not widely known by residents and people who use the bridal path regularly. This has left little time to properly prepare before the deadline for a decision by the council.	• See response to PO33 in relation to ecology. • See response to PO33 in relation to loss of views. • The BVW is a very significant attribute in the town and part of a national Sustrans cycle route. Therefore, any development in the area would be built around it. The route is generally buffered by trees and hedgerows. All new development bordering the route would be required to provide pedestrian and cycle links on to it. The Council has produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy and the BVW is identified within this document. It is not considered that development in this location would impact on the enjoyment of the route and long ranging views (e.g. to Mow Cop) and the wider countryside would remain. • The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. • The consultation period for planning documents at statutory stages is 6 weeks. This consultation was held over a longer time period.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO69	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				ADD03	Object	We think that the existing open space should remain and not be reduced by removal of green belt land as stated by the government	Comments noted.
PO444 PO839	Mr Gerard Hearson Mrs Ruth Hearson				ADD03	Object	Building on green belt should only happen when there are absolutely no alternatives and all other options have been considered and discounted. In this case, there is a credible alternative which will ensure that the beautiful green fields of ADD03 are not lost forever. Consider the land to the west of the old Victoria Colliery site. Although technically green belt, this is a reclaimed brown field site and is significantly better suited to the large building project being proposed. It is also unlikely to upset and antagonise a significant number of Biddulph residents, unlike the proposal to build on ADD03 and other similar sites which are nearer to the town centre. It is unclear why this site has not been formally proposed by SMDC officials? For the same reasons, also consider BD117 and between Bemersley Road and the A527 Tunstall Road as sensible alternatives to ADD03.	• See response to PO19 in relation to Green Belt Review and any exceptional circumstances. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like ADD03. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • BD117 is already being considered for housing.
PO298	Mr Peter Benn				ADD03	Object	Biddulph is now a commuter town with little remaining industry. No mills, mines, railways etc. are left. There are plenty of vacant lots in the town that should be developed before green belt land is built on. For example the abandoned mill and chapel on Station Road. Do you, as councillors want to be remembered for destroying open spaces with soulless estates; or restoring some character to the town?	• See response to PO444 in relation to use of Brownfield land inclu mills.
PO345	Miss Gemma Docksey				ADD03	Object	Re ADD03 Akesmore Lane I understand that the town needs to provide more homes under our current Government however taking a huge chunk out of the Green belt seems a drastic measure. This area is home to a wide range of wild life. We have owls, bats, and birds including Jays, badgers and foxes, just to name a few! At the moment this area is used for grazing livestock, an apt use of Green belt land. Could we consider reducing the acreage being reclaimed for housing on Akesmore Lane? We need to protect our wildlife and reduce the destruction of their natural habitats.	• See response to PO19 in relation to Green Belt Review and any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 in relation to loss of agricultural land

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO690	Mr Ian Turner				ADD03	Object	The amendment of the status of this location has been done by stealth and without the consent of those living in the vicinity. Having paid a premium to live in a rural area, this erosion of the green belt alters the environment we are living in significantly.	• The area was suggested as a potential development area during the last consultation on Site Options. It has been put forward in this consultation giving anyone the opportunity to comment. There are 2 more consultation stages and a public examination before the Local Plan is finalized. • See response to PO33 in relation to property prices • See response to PO33 in relation to visual impact
PO768	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				ADD03	Object	Greenbelt should stay as it is, not destroy a natural habitat for our wildlife, and also an area of beauty. There are plenty of brownfield sites to build on.	• See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 in relation to visual impact • See response to PO444 in relation to brownfield sites (including mills)
PO451	Mrs Kirsty Murphy				ADD03	Object	This area provides a haven for wild life with badgers, foxes and rabbits. It runs next to the tracks which provide beautiful countryside walks and is used by cyclists, walkers and runners etc. It is well known feature of Biddulph and to build in this area which have a drastic effect on the wildlife and usage of the track. I understand the area has been previously considered by yourselves and deemed unsuitable for a number of reasons e.g drainage and previous mining so why is it being considered again? The is already a high volume of water which runs of this land onto Haydon Park and in particular into Mason drive with problems to number 22 which has permanent sandbags to the side of their drive. The area clearly provides natural drainage which it struggles to cope with and building would cause a host of problems with drainage, without the natural drainage where is the water expected to go? There is no suitable access to this land which would provide adequate access for the houses and in particular the volume of traffic a new school would create. More suitable sites have been identified by council members who sat on the panel at the meeting at Biddulph Town hall which would have far less impact on the surrounding area. I can't see any good arguments for amending the area from green belt.	• See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact • See response to PO33 in relation to flooding / drainage • See response to PO33 in relation to mining • See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances
PO1358	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			ADD03	Object	Map 4.5 Biddulph - ADD03 - green belt release for housing with a possible school - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation on the Grade II listed building Whitehouse Cottage and its setting has been considered. Further information on this is required.	• See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1048	Mr John Hayley				ADD03	Object	I strongly oppose this proposed development. I am opposed to any green belt development taking place to the west of the Biddulph Valley Way and bounded by Tower Hill Road and Akemoor Lane. This represents unacceptable creeping urban sprawl and urbanisation of open countryside. In my view it is fundamentally wrong to place high density modern housing in the vicinity of Biddulph's last remaining 15th century cruck-frame thatched cottage. Without special care this development would destroy the landscape setting for one of Biddulph's most important historic buildings. [For more details on this please see my objections to site ADD04]. This site is not a suitable location for the proposed new primary school. I am opposed to any development that requires Wharf Road to be extended to the west of The Biddulph Valley Way. Such a proposal is likely to require very expensive reconstruction of the existing railway bridge and any such construction would cause major disruption to runners, ramblers, cyclists, horse riders, and others using the Biddulph Valley Way. Extending this road west of the railway line would make this area of open countryside highly vulnerable to urban encroachment in the future. The proposed new town boundary for this site [ADD03] has no physical boundaries to the south west prevent unchecked incursion into surrounding Green Belt countryside making this location vulnerable to future encroachment. There is a danger that this town boundary change will lead to further encroachment and urban sprawl towards Tower Hill Road in years to come. The proposed boundary does not meet NPPF criteria stating that a Green Belt change must have long term permanence capable of enduring for 30-50 years. These house should not be built on green field land. Town centre sites together with carefully selected brown field and reclaimed land sites elsewhere could be developed to meet this need.	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "Large site on the western edge of Biddulph, comprising agricultural land and two farmsteads (Moodystreet Farm and Hollylane) and sheds, enclosed by Akemoor Lane to the west. The site is located beyond the dismantled railway, which currently forms a strong, vegetated settlement edge and limit to development. The site is inter-visible with the Green Belt to the west. Development within the site would encroach on the surrounding countryside, and would adversely affect the existing settlement edge. Development of the site could potentially compromise the surrounding sensitive countryside, as there would be no clear limit to development beyond the site. Site is of high landscape sensitivity." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • See response to PO444 in relation to brownfield sites (including mills) • See response to PO444 in relation to use of land at Childerplay Road and Victoria Colliery

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO928 PO924	Mr Robert Stockley Mrs Elaine Stockley				ADD03	Object	Green Belt: Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing places for people and for nature long into the future. Erosion of the Green belt will mean the end of the Biddulph Valley, and once that erosion starts there will be no stopping the development further into the green belt. The Biddulph Valley is a beautiful place to live, and if development continues up the green belt, we will no longer have a beautiful lovely place to live. ADD03 will create accident blackspots from the increased traffic on Wedgewood Lane, Halls Road and Akemoor Lane, not to mention the other end of Akemoor Lane at the junction with Tower Hill Road. The Victoria Colliery also encroaches into the green belt I believe, but this location has already been identified for development, and the residents of Brown Lees are expecting it, so why not build there, and join up with Newcastle BC to build a joint site. Neighbourhood plans: Under the Government’s pledges, local people are to have more control over the planning of their neighbourhoods and the protection of Green Belt areas. The development of Neighbourhood Plans is there to give more power to local allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their area and that local people should have the final say on developments in their town. Our objections: According to the “Local Development Framework” document, sustainable development means “A better quality of life for everybody now and in the future”. Why do we need all these extra houses in Biddulph, when there are so many empty properties in the town. These extra houses will put great pressure on the infrastructure - Medical centres, the sewerage system (already overloaded from current residents and the many visitors to Biddulph Grange Gardens, the Country Park, Biddulph Valley Way, Sports facilities, town centre etc..) and the quality of life for residents through increased congestion and pollution. We are astounded that you are considering a plan for houses and a school on the Green Belt land around Akemoor Lane. We have been told that this Green Belt land has been a last minute amendment to the plan, which suggests that you are attempting	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact • See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO444 in relation to Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district’s full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council’s own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. • See response to PO33 in relation to infrastructure • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. • The Local Plan production process, by its very nature, involves several stages of consultation at

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							to deceive people and go against all the principles of Neighbourhood planning. What are the reasons for adding Akesmore Lane to the plan? Biddulph is known as the Garden town of Staffordshire and yet you are willing to deprive local people and visitors of the beautiful countryside on the boundary of the town, which many people enjoy along the Biddulph Valley Way. You are prepared to disturb the wonderful bird/animal life and nature, which is in abundance there. Has an independent ecological survey been undertaken for this site to show the projected effect of water courses, will life (ironically Akesmore Lane has breeding curlews and lapwings (curlews being the bird shown on the SMDC logo!!) If you check old Ordinance Survey maps, you will see that this area used to be called "Lapwing fields". You are prepared to locate housing and a school next to the White Cottage, a very rare example of a Staffordshire thatched dwelling and Grade 1 listed. We have been informed at a recent resident's meeting that Staffordshire Moorlands District Offices are ignoring objections and ideas from our local Biddulph councillors and riding rough-shod over local people's wishes, going against all the principles of Neighbourhood plans. We are also very concerned that objections raised to the plan have so far not been uploaded to the relevant website - is this a ruse on your part to discourage people from making their objections, as well as making the website extremely difficult to locate from the main SMDC site? We believe that the Green Belt area proposed is unsuitable for building purposes, due to the many drift mines and the level of flooding over the last few years. Has there been a technical survey of flooding control in this area? There are extensive Brownfield sites in Biddulph and empty properties, which could be used rather than encroaching onto the Green Belt areas of the town. For example, the Victoria Colliery site has had millions spent on it (presumably from residents' council tax/income tax), so that it could be developed, so surely this would be an ideal option, meeting the government's commitment to prioritise Brownfield development and the aims of Neighbourhood planning. Another Brownfield site might be the Childerplay area, as well as other sites in the town, such as Whalley Street, Stringer Street, Cross Street, the ground behind the Leisure Centre (for the school), Caravan storage area, behind Chell's Yard. If we are not vigilant, we will be allowing our generation to spoil these Green Belt areas for generations to come. It is a terrible plan, badly presented, unscrutinised and rushed through - please stop now and think what you are doing. Above all, please listen to local people and adhere to the principles of Neighbourhood plans and the Government's commitment to Green Belt areas. ADD03 is encroaching into the Green Belt, and will start the erosion of our beautiful valley. Even though the Victoria Colliery site is within	which point anyone can suggest further sites for inclusion in the plan and the Council decides on whether they are appropriate. This site was suggested as part of the site options consultation. • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • The comments made online on the Council's consultation portal will all be uploaded for public viewing at the same time. • There was a link to the consultation portal from the SMDC website homepage throughout the consultation • See response to PO33 in relation to mining • See response to PO33 in relation to drainage / flooding • See response to PO444 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. All sites listed have been investigated.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							some green belt, Newcastle Borough Council have agreed to merge a site on the boundary, which would benefit both councils. Together with Childerplay Lane, this has to be the preferred option. Any erosion of the green belt will have a lasting effect, and Biddulph Valley will gradually cease to exist.	
PO922	Mrs Dianne Simcock				ADD03	Object	The land is riddled with mines and unsafe. I understand this has been pointed out to the planners but they don't care. What are the financial repercussions for the council tax payer in future law suits for negligence in allowing housing to be knowingly built on an unsafe area?	• See response to PO33 in relation to mining.
PO1202	Mr M Jones				ADD03	Object	Use of green belt site when other Brown Field site are more appropriate detracting on the setting of a grade 2 listed building impact on the wildlife, traffic shall be impact on the existing roads.	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO444 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO33 in relation to ecology
PO1203	Mrs P Jones				ADD03	Object	The use of green belt land when there is more brownfield sites in the area more suitable. Site of a listed building. Impact on the wildlife. Old open cast mining. Akesmore lane entrance is already very very dangerous! With many near misses. Akesmore Lane floods and the land behind Smokies way to floods	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO444 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 in relation to mining • See response to PO33 in relation to flooding / drainage • See response to PO33 in relation to highways
PO1207	Mr J Hopkins				ADD03	Object	I feel it is unnecessary to change the green belt boundaries when decent site like just outside the Biddulph Town boundary and yet it would be ideal for development. The site assessment form for the land East of Akesmore Lane who deemed unsuitable for development in July 2015 the strategic housing land availability assessment and yet the proposed developments for housing and 1 st school as here why is this?	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO444 in relation to Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane. • The relevant SHLAA record, BD140, does not support development of this site giving the reasons of access and landscape character. Since the record was written, it has been established that access would not be an issue which would prevent development of the site. Recent evidence has shown that development of the site would have a high impact on landscape sensitivity. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1208	Mrs P Young				ADD03	Object	Access into Akesmore Lane already like a rat run! Noise pollution/more litter kids roaming up and down the lane. We don't want affordable homes lowering the tone of our neighbourhood!! The school should be built where the old Meadows School was already set up ready with fields. The lane will not take more traffic.	• See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO928 in relation to noise/pollution/residential amenity • Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet).
PO1211	Mr J Leek				ADD03	Object	Do not take our green belt there are other sites (brown) once it's gone its gone. So many people enjoy the view as they walk along this part of Biddulph Valley Way. This walk can be enjoyed by so many people but only minutes from the town centre not so many towns can boast this amenity so why take it away.	• See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO444 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4650	Mrs E Heathcote				ADD03	Object	Why is this plot now being considered? In June 2015 at site assessments it appears as plot BD140, as for its suitability, the conclusion drawn was 'not considered suitable for development due to potential access difficulties and the rural character of this area! I wish to object the proposed housing site ADD03, which is sited on land adjacent to Akesmore Lane and the Biddulph Valley Way. I object on the following grounds: The proposed site is a intrusion into Green Belt. The lane is very old. It is clearly marked on the Mainwaring Estate Map of 1597 – indeed probably much older, typical of such early origins it twists and turns and in places deep and narrow. It snakes alongside one our historically significant houses – the thatched 'White House'. How can you justify developing in this landscape which is set in history of the town. It would affect its character and setting within the landscape. As is usual with lanes of this antiquity the hedges are of great importance and I'm certain that they support a variety of flora and fauna. Surely development will lead to damage of these ancient hedgerows. The road today is used as a short cut to Mow Cop. With Such extensive development this rat run is going to see a huge increase in traffic. The quality of the road is exceedingly poor: ditches either side in part huge potholes. In order for it to serve a development and a school it would require investment along the length of the road from Tower Hill junction to junction at Wedgewood Lane. In Biddulph Valley Way is much loved and well used resource within the community development would detract from the outlook, peace and tranquillity which are doubtlessly enjoyed by users. The BVW acts as a physical barrier to development. To go beyond it would leave development up the valley side. This would impact on the views of the town from many areas.	- See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances - See response to PO1207 in relation to the site being listed as unsuitable in the SHLAA - See response to PO33 in relation to highways - See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact - See response to PO1048 in relation to landscape impact - See response to PO33 in relation to ecology - If the site is developed hedgerows would be retained within the scheme layout wherever possible. - See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact
PO4588	Mr & Mrs K Shone				ADD03	Object	Why are we building on Green Belt land? This amended Green Belt land should not be built until all the available Brown Belt land has been utilised.	- See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances - See response to PO444 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills
PO4593	Mrs & Miss J & A Carter/Vickers				ADD03	Object	Farms & scenery Thatcher's Cottage (white) (listed building) Sites of historic mines Wildlife Footpaths Do not change Green to Brown Why not use the old Victoria Colliery Keep my horses on Akesmore Lane not happy (Amy)	- See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact - See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact - See response to PO33 in relation to mining - See response to PO33 in relation to ecology - Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage. - See response to PO444 in relation to Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4594	Mr M Boden				ADD03	Object	Keep Akemore Lane as Green Belt save all the wildlife. Lane is too narrow to put footpaths and winding bends there are mine shafts in area and slag heaps. We have a listed building in the area. Need land for livestock to graze in the area. A lot of running water from the natural streams, there is no sewers as I cannot go on using septic tanks. Don't want any houses build on the lane causing excessive traffic. I struggle to get out of my drive as it is.	• See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO33 in relation to mining • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • See response to PO33 in relation to agricultural land value • See response to PO33 in relation to drainage / flooding • See response to PO928 in relation to sewerage infrastructure
PO4597	Mr S Wood				ADD03	Object	Akesmore Lane is a very narrow for the amount of cars that will be going up and down. We need farm land we get a lot of flooding outside our house now, without building new houses. We have an ancient listed building in Akemore Lane, the thatched white house. We have mine shafts in the building area.	• See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO33 in relation to agricultural land value • See response to PO33 in relation to drainage / flooding • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • See response to PO33 in relation to mining
PO4598	Mr J Hodgkinson				ADD03	Object	Why must we build on designated Green Belt land which is rich in both beauty and diverse nature and has also a historic building when there is a site crying out to be developed i.e.: the old Victoria Colliery Site.	• See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact • See response to PO33 in relation to ecology • See response to PO33 in relation to heritage impact • See response to PO444 in relation to Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane.
PO6264	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				ADD03	Object	Object to Green Belt amendment to include this site. The site has very significant highway challenges and much uncertainty over land ownership let alone the fact that it provides for a very significant projection (a large finger) eastwards into open countryside and away from the town which is especially damaging in Green Belt terms. Disagree with the results of the Green Belt Review and consider that an alternative view should be reached in relation to this site as follows: This site breaches the greenway which otherwise provides a strong and very defensible long term Green Belt boundary. It projects a finger of development into the Green Belt which set a precedent for further infill to the South of this site in the future let alone being an unacceptable encroachment into the green Belt in its own right. In addition to this the ground rises to the site and lies adjacent to the greenway making the site highly visible. It is considered that this site makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt and its loss should be avoided. The council are reminded of its own findings in respect of AD003 in the 2015 SHLAA where on the site assessment form the council stated: Site AD003 • A new access would need to be created probably across BVW as Akemoor Lane likely to be too narrow to serve a large number of dwellings. • In floodplain of	• See response to PO33 in relation to highways • The Council is currently investigating land ownership issues in this area. • See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO1207 in relation to the site being listed as unsuitable in the SHLAA

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							three watercourses which runs through and under site. Consult EA and SCC. Works on watercourses will need Land Drainage Consent of SCC. Consult EA on surface water (over 1ha). FRA needed. • Intrusion into the Green Belt. Area rural in character. Goes beyond BVW. Access. Likely to be a number of landowners. FRA needed. The council considered the site to be a category C site in 2015 SHLAA and it was not identified in the Site options and development boundaries consultation in July of 2015.	
PO6264	Mr N Lunt				ADD03	Object	This is a Green Belt site and building houses here will result in the removal of the open aspect and the views currently experienced when using Biddulph Valley Way as a walk way/cycle path. Building here also removed the Biddulph Valley Way as a strong boundary to protect the Green Belt. Road access to this site is totally unsuitable and seems quite unbearable that this site is even being proposed after being rejected in the original allocation by SMDC.	• See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact • See response to PO19 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • See response to PO33 in relation to highways • See response to PO1207 in relation to the site being listed as unsuitable in the SHLAA
PO9776	Mr M Barlow				ADD03	Object	This is an area of outstanding natural beauty please don't spoil it. It is not suitable for building.	• See response to PO33 & PO39 in relation to impact on BVW / visual impact
PO5866 PO5650 PO6055 PO6008 PO5672 PO5544 PO6594 PO6456 PO6552 PO6435 PO6829 PO5621 PO5441 PO6035 PO6968 PO5528 PO5487 PO5423 PO5473 PO6908	Mr and Mrs G. Freeman M Mitchell Mr Reg Grimwood Mrs L Price Mr K Davies Mrs M Moffatt Mrs Beverley Holding Mr Norman Smith Mrs Ann James Mr Paul Malkin Mr D Wickstead Mr A Barbeard Mrs K Hallam Mr T Barker Mr K Allen Mr N Moxon Mrs L Cook Mrs L Cook Mrs J Moxon Mr M Mason				ADD03	Object	I object	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6888	Mr G Mason							
PO6867	Mr A Copeland							
PO6854	Mrs I Latta							
PO6089	Mr I Frisby							
PO6070	Mr R Blood							
PO6105	Mr D Cantrill							
PO6124	Mrs J Frisby							
PO6142	Mrs J Collier							
PO6161	Mr K Collier							
PO5721	Mrs D Whalley							
PO5760	Mr J Hammond							
PO5376	Mr S Leese							
PO6292	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO6494	Mr Gilbert Bradley							
PO6641	Mr Ronald Bailey							
PO7395	Mr and Mrs D P Pass							
PO6349	Mr N Lunt							
PO6790	Mrs A Jones							
PO6415	Mr P Squires							
PO6808	Mr M Owen							
PO6929	Mrs J Brennan							
PO6401	Mr B Wilson							
PO8517	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8372	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO8459	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO8498	Miss L Delves							
PO8156	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO7542	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs							
PO8059	Mr B Hyde							
PO8020	Mr N Goode							
PO8037	Mr K Parry							
PO8001	Mrs A Brown							
PO7979	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7296	Mrs C Dale							
PO7234	Mrs L							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7192	Goodwin							
PO7173	Mr A Nixon							
PO7812	Mrs G Hall							
PO7843	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg							
PO7504	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7266	Mrs L Carter							
PO8736	Mr A Weston							
PO8848	Mr Stephen Willott							
PO8919	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8876	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO8692	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO7899	Mrs Joan Draisey							
PO7924	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7427	Mr J Swindell							
PO8600	Mr J Banister							
PO8642	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8671	Mr R Booth							
PO8712	Mr A Malbon							
PO8791	Mr R Willott							
PO8229	Mr S Holdcroft							
PO8244	Mrs P Kelly							
PO7718	Mr D Bradbury							
PO7802	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8975	Mrs P Hindmarsh							
PO8356	Mr N Mosson							
PO8336	Mrs S Bennett							
PO8542	Mr D Neal							
PO8581	Mrs J Sailes							
PO7761	Mr R Bradbury							
PO8410	Mr G Price							
PO7958	Mr A Lehepoo							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO305	Mr Russell Picken				ADD03	Support	If any further extension of the green belt is required, then it should occur on the western side of the town, in site BD116 and the area of site BD140, adjacent to the currently preferred sites of BD071 and BD071a, possibly extending southwards from area ADD03.	Comments noted.
PO287	Mr David Spruce				ADD03	Support	I do not believe that Biddulph needs this many new properties and I do not support the use of green belt, but I understand that we have to take control through the neighbourhood plan. Filling out to the West (to Akesmoor lane etc) gives a better distribution for the town which is close to the bypass and centre of the town.	Comments noted.
PO536	Mrs C Picken				ADD03	Support	It is extremely important to both the communities of Biddulph and Biddulph Moor that the green belt is not extended eastwards in the northern half of the town, which would then result in urban sprawl; one of the main things that the green belt was designed to protect towns and villages from in semi-rural locations like these. (Further development here would have resulted in the town appearing similar to a foreign holiday resort, where the properties extend from the valley floor all the way up the side of the valley to the horizon.) It is therefore welcomed, with great appreciation, that the sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 have been removed from preferred options of allocation of sites. If any further extension of the green belt is required, then it should occur on the western side of the town, in site BD116 and the area of site BD140, adjacent to the currently preferred sites of BD071 and BD071a, possibly extending southwards from area ADD03. Further development to the West gives the opportunity to achieve a better balance to the town.	Comments noted.
PO718	Mr Philip Beech				ADD03	Support	I wholly support the amendment to the green belt on this occasion, as the use of ADD03 makes absolute sense. It is closer to the town centre than many of the other proposed or constrained green belt sites, thus making it an obvious choice. Utilisation of ADD03 will not seriously erode the natural separation between Biddulph and the adjoining small urban areas of say Biddulph Moor or Mow Cop. It will help to redress the imbalance in the way in which Biddulph has been developed in the past. Too much development has taken place in the East and North of the town previously and this is an opportunity to address this.	Comments noted.
PO652 PO659	Mrs Siobhan Perry Mr Andrew Perry				ADD03	Support	I believe filling the development of Biddulph to the West would be a far better balance for the town.	Comments noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO788	Mrs Jayne Beech				ADD03	Support	I support the use of ADD03 for development. There are few other sites within Biddulph which offer an opportunity to develop without causing major upset to existing residential developments. Access to this area is straightforward, due to the close proximity to the town centre and by-pass. Although the use of green belt land isn't a preferred approach, I appreciate the need to develop, so support the inclusion of ADD03 in the changes.	Comments noted.
PO777	Mrs Jayne Beech				ADD03	Support	I support the revision of the Green Belt proposal relating to ADD03. This site lends its self to development, as it is within close proximity of the town centre - public transport - doctors - dentists etc. Also, the impact of developing ADD03 will have a minor visual impact to the western side of the Biddulph valley due to its location. Developing ADD03 will help to address some of the imbalance that has occurred over the years, where most developments took place to the East side of the town. This has created a shortage in School place allocation amongst other problems.	Comments noted.
PO10204	Mr Stan Charlesworth				ADD03	Support	(Summary) Support for development in this location for the following reasons: new dwellings would be close to the town centre and services and facilities make Biddulph more compact support for a new Primary School within the site.	Comments noted.
PO9974	Ms Ashley Kirkham				ADD03	Support	Building on Green Belt on the west of Biddulph would make the town more geographically balanced.	Comments noted.
PO9967	Ms Claire Kirkham				ADD03	Support	Using Green Belt to the west would achieve a better balance in the town and be closer to amenities.	Comments noted.
PO6248 PO8276 PO8135 PO8431 PO7939 PO8477 PO8190 PO8171 PO7506 PO8756 PO8938 PO8641 PO8210	Mrs S Goodwin Mr Matthew Gratton Ms Barbara Griffiths R Hutton Mr C Kirkham Mr B.W. Newton Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst Mrs Angela Turner Mrs L Carter Mrs Maureen Whitehurst Mr and Mrs G Bowyer Mr R Booth Mr D Smith				ADD03	Support	I support	Comments noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD03)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8295 PO8562 PO8117 Forrester PO8893 PO9672 Mrs P Hancock PO5699 Mr Jason Eardley PO5801 Mr Stephen Clowes PO6660 Ms Heather Mason PO6571 Mr Jeffrey Leese PO6680 Mrs J M Slater PO5781 Mr E Pearl PO5587 Mrs S Wilshaw PO5567 Mr R Wilshaw PO5395 Mrs S Harper PO7019 Mrs D Stuttard PO6868 Mr A Copeland PO5967 Mr M Clews PO6614 Mr and Mrs W Summerscales PO7337 Ms Emma Eardley PO6474 Mr K Rowland PO6703 Mrs D Cook PO5603 Mr Lewis Williams PO5844 Mr Carl Mason PO5745 Mrs Eileen Smith PO5822 Mr Christopher Slater PO9855 Mr Gayle								

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4283	Mr & Mrs Wilkes				ADD04	Object	In response to this public consultation I wish to object to the proposed development of 150-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley (Site ADD04) for reasons which are explained below. Settlement: Biddulph / Knypersley Response Question Number: 17 (Green Belt Amendment) - Site Reference: ADD04 (Off Harlech Drive, Knypersley) - Nature of response: Objection As a local resident I call on SMDC to remove area ADD04 (Harlech Drive, Knypersley) from the 2012-2031 Local Plan Preferred Option Sites. This community is opposed to Green Belt development and we believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council needs to consider the following: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - 1. NPPF (paragraph 83) states that “once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”. The council’s plans do not justify “exceptional circumstances” that would require them to build on unspoiled green field land to meet their current housing targets. Town centre sites together with carefully selected reclaimed land sites elsewhere could be developed to meet this need. 2. NPPF (paragraph 111) states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field sites. However, the preferred option plans as recommended at Stage 2 consultation offer up green field sites in preference to other brown field site developments already proposed. Sites which have been suggested to the town council as part of our local neighbourhood plan include: the “mill triangle” and other town centre sites; reclaimed land adjacent to Childerplay Lane; and reclaimed land to the west of Victoria Business Park near to Brown Lees. 3. NPPF (paragraphs 156-157) states that infrastructure must come first, yet outline plans to provide new infrastructure are not being prepared in advance. Currently there are no plans for historic conservation of the Knypersley Hall estate. There is no green infrastructure plan and no plans to develop sport and recreation to the south east of Knypersley. 4. NPPF (paragraphs 83 & 85). The proposed new Green Belt boundaries for site ADD04 are illogical because they follow arbitrary field boundaries. There are no physical boundaries to prevent unchecked incursion into surrounding countryside making this location extremely vulnerable to future encroachment. The proposed boundary does not meet NPPF criteria stating that a Green Belt change must have long term permanence capable of enduring for 30-50 years. SMDC Green Belt Review Study 5. Development of 150-250 houses on this site potentially is the first step in a wider plan to develop a new school and up to 1,070 houses within Green Belt Review Area N17. This represents creeping erosion of Biddulph’s open countryside. Urbanisation on this scale within the Green Belt is unacceptable and would have a large negative impact on	• In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study concludes that the overall impact of this area on Green Belt purposes is moderate. It states that: “This is a significant area of land which cannot be readily subdivided because of an absence of clear internal boundaries. It is well contained physically and visually by Mill Hayes Road and whilst making a contribution to Green Belt purposes in respect of separation and setting, comprehensive masterplanning (which would retain existing open space and sports pitches) could yield a development which would help to reinforce wider Green belt function. It recommends considering site ADD04 for release from the Green Belt. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph’s housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like ADD04. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for
PO4234	Mr & Mrs R Worth							
PO4028	Mrs Gillian Beech							
PO4083	Kyoko Boll							
PO4085	Mr L.J. Hart							
PO4185	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO3959	Mr and Mrs J Lythgoe							
PO4086	Mr and Mrs J Lythgoe							
PO4312	Mr J Woollam							
PO4510	Ms G Hammond							
PO4282	Mrs L Pointon							
PO4281	Miss A Thompson							
PO4278	Mr K Thompson							
PO4280	Mrs E Pollitt							
PO4279	Mrs A Thompson							
PO4435	Mr Whitmore							
PO4552	Mr and Mrs T A Lewis							
PO4489	Mrs Alison Baskeyfield							
PO4551	Mr and Mrs T A Lewis							
PO4277	Mrs S Bailey							
PO4276	Mr E Chadwick							
PO4275	Mr B Adle							
PO4274	Miss L Johnson							
PO4273	Mr P Cheetham							
PO4272	Mr N Austin							
PO4268	Mr L Wright							
PO4269	Mr P Robinson							
PO4270	Mr J Baker							
PO4271	Mrs G Clear							
PO4266	Mr C Haywood							
PO4264	Mr D Owen							
PO4263	Mr P Callagran							
PO4261	Mrs J White							
PO4262	Mrs T Callagran							
PO4265	Mr S Haywood							
PO4257	Mr F Aston							
PO4258	Mr T Siddall							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4254	Mr H Gregory						existing countryside in Biddulph South, an area of outstanding natural beauty. 6. The Green Belt Review recommends that (other than BD117, BD069 & BD131B) there should be no release of Green Belt in area N17 within the plan period 2012-2031. It then states that, if desired, the council could reconsider this area for release in a future Local Plan. Thus, the inclusion of ADD04 as a Preferred Site at this time is inappropriate and is contrary to the review study's recommendations. Impact on highway traffic and road safety 7. Site access would be via a narrow private road leading to a farm track. The entrance road may need to be widened making this site impossible or difficult to develop without complex land acquisition. 8. The area around Harlech Drive and Conway Road has three schools in the immediate vicinity already and is affected by high traffic flow at peak times. 180-280 new houses (ADD04 & BD069 combined) would cause an estimated increase in traffic flow of up to 550 extra cars causing significant extra traffic problems. 9. This site is not a suitable location for the proposed new school. Knypersley already has a pre-school nursery and a primary school nearby. Entrance to the site is via a quiet residential district mainly occupied by elderly people. Quality of life will be harmed and there could be significant disruption to the existing community. Effect on the landscape 10. Open countryside, public footpaths, historic parkland in the vicinity of Knypersley Hall (Grade II* listed), the fishing pool, the cricket pavilion, and fields adjacent to Knypersley Cricket Ground are all an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. (The cricket ground itself was donated to the community by Robert Heath). Open countryside forms an integral part of the surrounding natural landscape and, if developed upon, connection between the Knypersley community and the natural environment would be lost forever. 11. Development of this site would cause significant harm to Knypersley's sense of place and to its unique semi-rural village identity centred upon Newpool Meadows, the cricket ground and pavilion, and its magnificent landscape setting. This new housing would significantly harm the local landscape and potentially could damage the separate "village community" identity that Knypersley enjoys at present. NPPF policy states that merging of neighbouring communities is to be prevented. 12. Footpath 11, which runs from Harlech Drive to Mill Hayes Lane, provides access to beautiful open countryside for the town as a whole. This path provides important public access to open space overlooking the cricket ground and to a large area of open countryside beyond. This footpath interconnects Biddulph with Greenway Bank Country Park to the south making this a strategically important area requiring special Green Belt protection. It is not an area of derelict land requiring urban infill. The proposed development would cause significant	development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a remnant of the parkland, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts'. It should be noted that this study forms part of a wider
PO4256	Mr R Armitt							
PO4252	Mrs A Callen							
PO4248	Mr P Vickers							
PO4259	Mr G Heath							
PO4250	Mr P Key							
PO4253	Mr C Durber							
PO4247	Mr T Lakin							
PO4255	Mr G Tinsley							
PO4260	Mr B White							
PO4267	Mrs M Haywood							
PO4251	Mrs D Key							
PO4249	Mrs G Vickers							
PO4246	Mrs D Harold							
PO4245	Mr W Harold							
PO4241	Mr O Orchard							
PO4239	Mr P Hill							
PO4244	Mrs M Orchard							
PO4240	Mrs T Bartle							
PO4242	Mr D Orchard							
PO4238	Mrs H Morris							
PO4243	Mrs CM Orchard							
PO4237	Mr B Morris							
PO4236	Mrs S Silverwood							
PO4190	Mr M Shaw							
PO4189	Mr P Edwards							
PO4192	Mr J Boulton							
PO4193	Mrs M Joyce							
PO4195	Mr I Jukes							
PO4191	Mrs K Sumnall							
PO4194	Miss C Jukes							
PO4196	Mr C Barry							
PO4197	Mrs S Barry							
PO4195	Mr I Jukes							
PO4198	Mr J Walker							
PO4200	Mrs Longshaw							
PO4202	Mrs P Heath							
PO4210	Mr D Wickstead							
PO4204	Mr G Murphy							
PO4201	Mr D Heath							
PO4199	Mrs J Walker							
PO4203	Mr And Mrs T & E Dean							
PO4205	Mr W Atkinson							
PO4206	Mr A Lawton							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4211 PO4208 PO4207 PO4209 PO4215 PO4214 PO4212 PO4217 PO4188 PO4216 PO4220 PO4223 PO4213 PO4222 PO4218 PO4221 PO4187 PO4186 PO4224 PO4226 PO4225 PO4228 PO4227 PO4232 PO4229 PO4230 PO4235 PO4231 PO4184 PO3991 PO4061 PO4180 PO4179 PO4181 PO4183 PO4182 PO4174 PO4173 PO4175 PO4178 PO4176 PO4172 PO4170 PO4171 PO4553	Mr E Payne Mr K Atkinson Mr And Mrs T & L Clewes Mr P Hancock Miss S Hollies Mrs S Hollies Mr G Cassidy Mr J Howsworth Mr D Butler Mrs L Heath Mr N Dutton Mr D Washington Mr C Hollies Mr E Alcock Mrs C Gorman Mrs P Butler Mr W Tagell Mr D Washington Mr G Walker Mr D Job Mr R Capper Mrs A Hancock Mr A Dean Mr A Oaks Mr D Spender Mr C Slaney Mrs M Fenton Mr N Moorey Mr C Warburton Mr C Warburton Mr A Oaks Mr A Bourne Miss L Venables Mrs J Bourne Mr CB James Mr A Bourne Mr A Walley Mr A Taylor Mr K Hogan Mrs J Skinner Mr P Allen Mr T Thompson Mr F Copeland Mrs P Hulme Mrs Dawn						harm to our green infrastructure objectives. Biddulph's footpaths should pass through open countryside, not through an urban landscape. Historic conservation of the natural environment 13. For many years the Green Belt around Biddulph has made a significant contribution towards protecting its major historic assets including Knypersley Hall and nearby historic parkland. The council's 2010 Historic Environment Character Assessment Report identifies numerous heritage assets near to the hall which connect the de Knypersley, Bowyer, Bateman, and Heath families to this area and which form an important part of understanding both the history of Biddulph Grange Gardens and of Biddulph as a whole. The report recommends that the remnants of its historic parkland should be conserved and states that " development is not deemed to be appropriate within this zone ". The proposed ADD04 development is incompatible with this objective and therefore makes the site completely unsuitable for high density housing. 14. Further south lies an area of ancient valley farmland, the last remaining such farmland in the Biddulph Valley. The conservation of this area is also recognised as important and this farmland, together with its historic field boundaries, should be preserved for the long term future benefit of our town's heritage. 15. Nearby Knypersley Fishing Pool is already designated as a protected nature conservation site. Existing hedgerows within the proposed ADD04 site boundary host a large array of wildlife that would perish as a result of this development. Bats are known to live nearby. Therefore this site, if developed for housing, could have a serious detrimental impact on nature conservation efforts in this locality.	evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development. • The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the Preferred Options plan. • The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. • From the Highway Authority's point of view, a Transport Assessment would be required at the planning application stage. Creation of an access directly onto the A527 is preferred though a limited amount of development could be accommodated using an access onto Harlech Drive. No concerns were raised by the Highway Authority about any localised traffic problems as a result of development here. • Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4177 PO4169 PO4167 PO4168 PO4164 PO4165 PO4163 PO4166 PO4159 PO4096 PO4139 PO4162 PO4161 PO4157 PO3987 PO4155 PO4153 PO4156 PO4154 PO4152 PO4160 PO4550 PO4158 PO4151 PO4148 PO4150 PO4149 PO4147 PO4144 PO4146 PO4084 PO4140 PO4145 PO4143 PO4142 PO4114 PO4141 PO4138 PO4132 PO4137 PO4133 PO4134 PO4135	Rowlands-Brough Mrs S Whalley Mrs M Beech Mr B Hammond Mr & Mrs P and R Young Mr A Smith Mr A Smith Mr A Price Mr S Burdon Mr T Jones Mr D Nagington Mr P Adams Mrs S Price Mrs J Smith Mr D Proctor Mr P Ball Mrs D Hill Mr T Leese Mr P Ball Mr L Jones Mr S Machin Mr J Cumberbatch Mr J A Poole Mr W Jones Mr J Wilshaw Mr K Goodwin Mrs D Swindells Mr J Swindells Mrs L Goodwin Mr D Parkinson Mrs L Hopkins Mrs L Hopkins Mrs F Jukes Mrs S Kelly Mrs M Parkinson Mrs J Bryer Mrs M Peers Mr A Barker Mr T Sutton Mr A Slaney Mr D Hill Mrs J Morris Mrs P Meredith Mr C Morgan							of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. • Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'Site comprises land to the west and south of Knypersley Hall, including a large, open field which slopes down from the hall in the north of the site, and more undulating land in the south of the site containing a pond and scattered trees. The site is separated from the settlement edge by Knypersley Hall and agricultural land to the north. Development of the site could adversely affect the existing settlement form, particularly in the southern extent of the site. The northern section of the site has high visual prominence, particularly when viewed from Tunstall Road. Site is of high landscape sensitivity. Please note that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage. • Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD04 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended].

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4131	Mrs J Leese							
PO4130	Mr C Hawkes							
PO4129	Mrs J Embleton							
PO4128	Mrs M Brown							
PO4127	Mr T Brown							
PO4126	Mrs D Edwards							
PO4125	Miss K Edwards							
PO4124	Mr M Edwards							
PO4123	Mr W Edwards							
PO4122	Mrs M Mountford							
PO4121	Mrs J Hazlewood							
PO4119	Mr T Beardmore							
PO4118	Miss T Mackenzie							
PO4117	Miss J Brassington							
PO4116	Mrs G Griffins							
PO4115	Mr D Thwaites							
PO4112	Miss L Rogers							
PO4111	Mr D Rogers							
PO4110	Mr K Pass							
PO4109	Mr M Dickens							
PO4108	Mrs J Robertson							
PO4107	Mrs T Brian							
PO4106	Mr R Gannon							
PO4105	Mr M Carr							
PO4104	Mr A Jones							
PO4103	Mr L Copeland							
PO4102	Mr D Rowley							
PO4101	Mrs W Pass							
PO4100	Mr JK James							
PO4099	Mrs T James							
PO4098	Mrs C Hatton							
PO4097	Mr P Stansfield							
PO3963	Mr D Nagington							
PO4095	Mr P Stansfield							
PO4094	Mr G Sargent							
PO4093	Mrs J Sergeant							
PO4092	Mrs A Nixon							
PO4091	Mrs F Challinor							
PO4090	Mr E Bamping							
PO4089	Mr P Williams							
PO4088	Mrs S Williams							
PO4136	Mrs Perry							
PO4087	Mrs Y Thwaits							
PO4082	Mr M Hancock							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4081	Mrs G Whilding							
PO4080	Mrs J Bould							
PO4079	Mr S Cole							
PO4078	Mr M Brown							
PO4077	Mr D Baker							
PO4076	Mr A Jones							
PO4075	Mr D Rigby							
PO4074	Mr P Austin							
PO4073	Mrs S Barbour							
PO4072	Mr A Baker							
PO4071	Mrs J Hardy							
PO4070	Mrs L Hardy							
PO4069	Mr D Barbour							
PO4068	Mr M Ryder							
PO4067	Mr S Ryder							
PO4066	Mr M Baker							
PO4065	Miss A Forrester							
PO4064	Mr M Caddie							
PO4063	Mr D Weaver							
PO4062	Mrs Jo Weaver							
PO4060	Mrs E Oaks							
PO4059	Mr C Nowak							
PO4058	Miss J Nowak							
PO4057	Mr S Lunn							
PO4056	Mrs E Bullock							
PO4055	Mr R Butler							
PO4054	Mrs M Forrester							
PO4053	Mrs E Davies							
PO4052	Mr J Davies							
PO4051	Miss C Butcher							
PO4050	Mr J Oaks							
PO4049	Mr & Mrs T W Barber							
PO4048	Mr R Carter							
PO4047	Mrs B Jones							
PO4046	Mrs J Carter							
PO4045	Mrs T Mellor							
PO4044	Mr P Mellor							
PO4043	Mrs J Hall							
PO4042	Mr A Baines							
PO4040	Mrs M Stubbs							
PO4039	Mrs Triner							
PO4038	Mr D Spruce							
PO4037	Mrs M Spruce							
PO4036	Mrs J Worthington							
PO4035	Mr N Triner							
PO4034	Mr & Mrs G							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4033	Bailey Mr & Mrs A and M Jones							
PO4032	Mrs A Ellis							
PO4031	Mr K Til							
PO4030	Mr P Riley							
PO4029	Mr & Mrs P and P							
PO4027	Bradley/Rossiter Mrs J Edwards							
PO4026	Mr Edwards							
PO4025	Mr A Brown							
PO4024	Mrs L Brown							
PO4022	Mr K Brown							
PO4021	Mr J Woodward							
PO4018	Mrs D Woodward							
PO4019	Mr A Nixon							
PO4020	Mrs K Nixon							
PO4016	Mrs A Cartwright							
PO4015	Mrs I Armitt							
PO4014	Mrs M Dudley							
PO4013	Mr R Dudley							
PO4012	Mrs C Carter							
PO4011	Mrs S Jones							
PO4010	Mr C Adams							
PO4009	Mrs K Adams							
PO4008	Mrs B Hopkins							
PO4007	Mr P Hopkins							
PO4006	Mr and Mrs R Pointon							
PO4005	Mr M Fletcher							
PO4004	Mrs J Edwards							
PO4003	Mrs V Belford							
PO4002	Mrs S Millard							
PO4001	Mr B Hancock							
PO4000	Mr A Belford							
PO3999	Mr and Mrs A and A Potts							
PO3998	Mr J Byatt							
PO3997	Mr R Bayley							
PO3996	Mr Longshaw							
PO3995	Mr A Hulme							
PO3994	Mrs K Nicosia							
PO3953	Mr B Thwaites							
PO3952	Mrs S Rogers							
PO3944	Mr J Yates							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO3958	Mr C Gola							
PO3957	Mrs F Bannister							
PO3956	Mrs W Woodward							
PO3955	Mr E Hughes							
PO3954	Mr M Castle							
PO3981	Mr T Brough							
PO3980	Mr D Brough							
PO3979	Mr D Rhodes							
PO3978	Mrs S Rhodes							
PO3977	Mr D Waterhouse							
PO3976	Mrs C Waterhouse							
PO3975	Mr M Wrench							
PO3973	Mrs E Brown							
PO3972	Mrs S Andrew							
PO3971	Mr R Andrew							
PO3970	Mrs V Darn							
PO3969	Mr N Wood							
PO3968	Mr W Latham							
PO3967	Mr M Taylor							
PO3966	Mr kirkham							
PO3965	Mrs B Biddulph							
PO3964	Miss K Wrench							
PO3962	Mr M Wright							
PO3961	Mr D Facey							
PO3960	Mrs E Lockett							
PO3951	Mr J Smith							
PO3950	Mrs B Harrison							
PO3949	Mr W Harrison							
PO3948	Mr D Poole							
PO3947	Mrs C Whitworth							
PO3946	Mr R Whilding							
PO3945	Mr I Travers							
PO3993	Mr K Allen							
PO3992	Mr T Cumming							
PO3990	Mr and Mrs Dunn							
PO3989	Mr A Ralston							
PO3986	Mr M Hopkins							
PO3985	Mr R Whilding							
PO3984	Mr J Clews							
PO3983	Mr J Cucyk							
PO3982	Mrs K Hartford							
PO4304	Mrs D Wemyss							
PO4303	Mrs D Tarr							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4302	Mr T Tarr							
PO4301	Mr S Lally							
PO4300	Mrs B Lally							
PO4299	Mr A Dutton							
PO4298	Mrs T Dutton							
PO4297	Mr W Barnett							
PO4296	Mrs L Barnett							
PO4295	Mrs J Nixon							
PO4294	Mr R Nixon							
PO4292	Mrs P Wemyss							
PO4291	Mrs N Baker							
PO4290	Mr A Carr							
PO4289	Mrs A Carr							
PO4288	Mr T Carr							
PO4287	Mrs P Carr							
PO4286	Mr K Latter							
PO4285	Mrs J Latter							
PO4390	Mrs C Gregory							
PO4391	Mrs J Smith							
PO4484	Mr T Lakin							
PO4378	Mr A Bloor							
PO4309	Mr R Dale							
PO4379	Mr D James							
PO4377	Mr R Simms							
PO4308	Mrs S Slaney							
PO4307	Mr D Slaney							
PO4310	Mrs J Dale							
PO4375	Mrs A Shepherd							
PO4305	Mrs G Williams							
PO4389	Mr D John							
PO4306	Mrs P Finney							
PO4387	Mrs S Stevenson							
PO4384	Mr E Barker							
PO4385	Mrs L Butler							
PO4383	Mrs L Bloor							
PO4311	Mrs C Jones							
PO4381	Mr J Cumberbatch							
PO4373	Mrs C Bowler							
PO4382	Mrs A Cumberbatch							
PO4388	Mr P Stevenson							
PO4370	Mr J Scarrett							
PO4371	Mrs H Green							
PO4374	Mr S Bowyer							
PO4368	Mr B Rushton							
PO4369	Mrs L Walley							
PO4380	Mrs I Peal							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4363	Mr H Wilshaw							
PO4367	Mr K Tunstall							
PO4366	Mrs S Tunstall							
PO4365	Mr J Scane							
PO4362	Mrs E Smith							
PO4358	Mrs S Jones							
PO4360	Mrs J Mcwalter							
PO4361	Mr A Smith							
PO4357	Mr G Armit							
PO4356	Mrs S Armit							
PO4355	Mr E Harding							
PO4354	Mr B Smith							
PO4353	Mr D Bourne							
PO4352	Mrs R Bourne							
PO4351	Mr M Forrester							
PO4348	Mrs J Jones							
PO4350	Mr K Forrester							
PO4349	Mr W Jones							
PO4359	Mr K Pearson							
PO4346	Mrs A Myatt							
PO4345	Mr G Collinge							
PO4344	Mrs I Page							
PO4341	Mr R Shallcross							
PO4340	Mrs I Shallcross							
PO4347	Mr J Breed							
PO4343	Mr A Page							
PO4339	Mr M Challinor							
PO4342	Mrs H Page							
PO4336	Mr D Evans							
PO4549	Mr M Challinor							
PO4338	Mrs W Phoenix							
PO4337	Mr N Phoenix							
PO4335	Mrs R Evans							
PO4334	Mrs E Jenkinson							
PO4333	Mr R Jenkinson							
PO4332	Mrs J Fletcher							
PO4331	Mr C Fletcher							
PO4330	Mr A Allman							
PO4329	Mrs A Allman							
PO4328	Mr R Shaw							
PO4327	Mrs GJ Shaw							
PO4326	Mr R Nash							
PO4325	Mrs M Nash							
PO4324	Mr G Nash							
PO4323	Mrs B hancock							
PO4321	Mrs D daniels							
PO4322	Mr D daniels							
PO4320	Mrs E downey							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4319	Mr S Powney							
PO4318	Mrs C Powney							
PO4317	Miss L Byrne							
PO4316	Miss E Schofield							
PO4315	Mrs M Wiggins							
PO4314	Mrs J Weston							
PO4313	Mr N Lovat							
PO4364	Mrs A Facey							
PO4442	Mr J Forster							
PO4441	Mr G Hopwood							
PO4440	Mr D Bounford							
PO4439	Mrs D Bounford							
PO4438	Mr D Sibsen							
PO4436	Mr D Sibsen							
PO4437	Mrs S Ball							
PO4386	Mr K Ball							
PO4434	Mrs B Ball							
PO4433	Mr P Ball							
PO4432	Mrs J Prophett							
PO4431	Mr D Prophett							
PO4426	Mrs D Webster							
PO4427	Mr M Palmer							
PO4430	Mrs T Edge							
PO4429	Mr S Edge							
PO4428	Mrs J Proctor							
PO4425	Mrs R Wemyss							
PO4424	Mr A Wemyss							
PO4423	Mrs E Hancock							
PO4422	Mrs S Homer							
PO4421	Mr Homer							
PO4420	Mrs E Elsmore							
PO4419	Mrs B Bailey							
PO4418	Mr A Hilton							
PO4417	Mr R Mathews							
PO4416	Mr B Street							
PO4411	Mrs C Critchlow							
PO4410	Mr D Critchlow							
PO4415	Mr D Fern							
PO4414	Mr P Wilson							
PO4413	Mrs C Wilson							
PO4412	Mr J Pepper							
PO4409	Mr D Bailey							
PO4408	Mrs S Lund							
PO4407	Mr G Lund							
PO4406	Mrs S Whiston							
PO4405	Mr C Evenson							
PO4404	Mrs L Evenson							
PO4403	Mrs J Holland							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4488	Mrs S Whiston							
PO4402	Mr W Sproston							
PO4401	Mr C Sproston							
PO4398	Mrs I Burgess							
PO4397	Mr C wright							
PO4395	Mr W Smallman							
PO4483	Mrs S Wood							
PO4474	Mrs H Gregory							
PO4470	Mrs V Mathews							
PO4471	Mrs L Jones							
PO4475	Mrs J Johnson							
PO4459	Mrs A Mahan							
PO4453	Mr W Chadwick							
PO4452	Mr T Wood							
PO4451	Mr D Cartwright							
PO4487	Mrs D Tilsley							
PO4506	Mr P Wright							
PO4507	Mr D Milburn							
PO4547	Mr D Finney							
PO4546	Mr P Swindells							
PO4545	Mrs G Swindells							
PO4527	Mrs G Milburn							
PO4525	Ms J Court							
PO4524	Ms B Brown							
PO4523	Mr G Claughan							
PO4522	Miss S Black							
PO4521	Mrs E Rowland							
PO4520	Mr T Rowley							
PO4518	Mrs A Forester							
PO4517	Mrs L Hammond							
PO4515	Mr I Newton							
PO4509	Mr J Harrison							
PO4556	Mrs D Garner							
PO4558	Mr K Bennett							
PO4559	Mrs M Dick							
PO4560	Mr M Brown							
PO4561	Mr W Brown							
PO4562	Mrs J Walker							
PO4563	Mr J Walker							
PO4554	Kyle Mellor							
PO4486	Mrs C Carter							
PO4485	Mrs K Nicosia							
PO4481	Mr P Sherratt							
PO4480	Mrs T Rowley							
PO4478	Mr J Bartle							
PO4479	Mrs D Gregory							
PO4477	Mr A Smith							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4473	Mr S Corcoran							
PO4472	Mr I Whiston							
PO4468	Mr M Matthews							
PO4464	Mr C Gordon							
PO4462	Mrs J Johnson							
PO4463	Mrs A Gordon							
PO4460	Mr R Bailey							
PO4457	Mr R Mahan							
PO4456	Mrs L Bayley							
PO4447	Mr M Hawker							
PO4454	Mrs A Webster							
PO4450	Mr T Blank							
PO4492	Mrs T Adams							
PO4448	Mrs MD Jones							
PO4504	Mr C Davies							
PO4505	Mrs J Wright							
PO4548	Mr D Finney							
PO4529	Mrs V Poole							
PO4528	Mr Loughlin							
PO4530	Mrs F Haynes							
PO4531	Mrs A Johnson							
PO4544	Mr P Drummond							
PO4543	Mrs J Salt							
PO4542	Mr P Salt							
PO4541	Mrs J Forster							
PO4540	Mrs C Elms							
PO4539	Mr G Elms							
PO4538	Mrs R Dale							
PO4537	Mr A Dale							
PO4536	Mrs F Nicosia							
PO4535	Mr M Kelly							
PO4534	Mrs G Hancock							
PO4533	Mr K Hancock							
PO4532	Mr B Goodwin							
PO4519	Miss G Bestwick							
PO4516	Mrs E Stubbs							
PO4514	Mr C Toft							
PO4513	Mrs A Harrison							
PO4512	Mrs K Saltwell							
PO4511	Mr R Rowland-Brough							
PO4508	Mrs J Drummond							
PO4555	Mr and Mrs A Alcock							
PO4656	Mrs A Case							
PO4655	Mr Tipper							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4233 PO4760 PO4763 PO4840 PO4842	Mr & Mrs M & P Smith Mr & Mrs K & C Alcock Mrs Harper							
PO4554	Kyle Mellor				ADD04	Object	It is disgraceful that this and other green belt sites are being put forward as preferred sites. These proposals will ruin the beautiful countryside and dilute our community. Please put the wishes of electorate ahead of the developers that will go onto to develop out greenbelt.	In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study concludes that the overall impact of this area on Green Belt purposes is moderate. It states that: "This is a significant area of land which cannot be readily subdivided because of an absence of clear internal boundaries. It is well contained physically and visually by Mill Hayes Road and whilst making a contribution to Green Belt purposes in respect of separation and setting, comprehensive masterplanning (which would retain existing open space and sports pitches) could yield a development which would help to reinforce wider Green belt function. It recommends considering site ADD04 for release from the Green Belt. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt.
PO4486	Mrs C Carter				ADD04	Object	We moved to Orme Road 4 and half years ago the quiet rural location in our retirement the majority of residents in the surrounding area are elderly residents and we think it's outrageous to put us in this situation. The traffic congestion and noise will spoil the surrounding areas massively.	- From the Highway Authority's point of view, a Transport Assessment would be required at the planning application stage. Creation of an access directly onto the A527 is preferred though a limited amount of development could be accommodated using an access onto Harlech Drive. No concerns were raised by the Highway Authority about any localised traffic problems as a result of development here. - Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
								vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues.
PO4485	Mrs K Nicosia				ADD04	Object	Risk of flooding the playing area of the cricket ground as the pool sits higher than the cricket area. Inappropriate in this area – seek area with less impact i.e.: Childerplay Road + surrounding areas at the Southern Side. RE: Schools if Kingsfield expanded + pupils (parents) living close to this school it would free up possibly places out at Knypersley + Oxhay. Would there need to be another school built.	- The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed. - See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding other brownfield sites as an alternative. - See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding schools.
PO4481	Mr P Sherratt				ADD04	Object	I object to this proposed development 100% as losing this beautiful area would be criminal! I very often use the footpath mentioned as a way to unwind after work, it is lovely to sit and look over the lovely pools and cricket pitch and enjoy all the nature that surrounds the area. Including rabbit, hare and owls in the dusk imagine losing all this nature and more just for a few bricks and mortar? Is this really fair?	- If this area is selected for development, the scheme would be designed to take into account its setting and heritage impact as well as any infrastructure and / or site constraints. A planning application would be required before any development could take place and this would be open for anyone to comment on. - See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding footpaths and ecology.
PO4480	Mrs T Rowley				ADD04	Object	I object to this proposal development 100%, myself and partner are both nature lovers and we use the foot path on a regular basis, as we go and walk the country to wind down. I don't think it's fair we should lose all of this nature animals habitat, natural relaxation for a few bricks and mortar, not to mention the added noise the building traffic from building and residents, as park lane is extremely busy anyway and to add to this isn't something good. I live where I live for the tranquillity it offers within a very short distance, and I certainly don't want to lose what we have.	- See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding footpaths and ecology. - See response to PO4486 regarding highways and noise.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4478	Mr J Bartle				ADD04	Object	The land travelling north from Knypersley pool reservoir/country park travelling through the proposed development is a very important wildlife corridor passing through the cricket club and onto the Biddulph Valley way used by badgers, pole cats and many other mammals and invertebrate's. First priority for new developments should be on brown field sites such as the old colliery where the impact upon the natural environment would be least left. There are several schools to the South West and the town. Badgers regularly forage in these proposed fields and should this important feeding foraging area be lost then they would be forced to forage on agricultural land surrounding the country park reducing there range and habitat.	See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology and use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO4479	Mrs D Gregory				ADD04	Object	I think it would be more viable to extend Knypersley First School as they have a field attached that hardly seems to be used, plus it already has the boundary fence they erected.	See response to PO4283 (at the top of this table) regarding school provision.
PO4477	Mr A Smith				ADD04	Object	We have streams of traffic already coming past our bungalow, if this site went ahead it would chaos to even get out of our drive, it would increase pollution and noise. Why don't you build more houses in Leek where there is more space and area for development?	- See response to PO4486 regarding highways and noise. - A higher proportion of the District's housing needs are proposed for Leek than Biddulph though, like Biddulph, there are constraints around Leek.
PO4473	Mr S Corcoran				ADD04	Object	There isn't sufficient infrastructure in place to withstand these extra houses/schools. Conway Road especially already struggles to cope with the school traffic. I don't see how this can be easily remedied. What this area really needs is some sort of car park for the collection of school children, more play areas and sports fields as Biddulph high school has seen fit to fence of playing fields and possibly more recreation facilities.	- See response to PO4283 (at the top of this table) regarding infrastructure provision and recreation. - See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4472	Mr I Whiston				ADD04	Object	Impact on the wildlife (barn and tawny owls) at the hall. Area cannot deal with the disruption Schools traffic is already absurd sort this problem before adding to it. Heavy trucks will damage the roads. Schools are not needed in this area. Only an idiot would allow the area to be built on.	- See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology and schools. - See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4468	Mr M Matthews				ADD04	Object	What a ridiculous site to propose building. On right up alongside homes that have been there for years, that people have worked hard for. To build on this open countryside will not only impact the environment impact on wildlife (Kestrels, buzzards, bats, badgers, to name but a few) it will impact on existing house values. As we moved here recently, specifically for the village community and surrounding countryside, we know that this was reflected in the house price. This proposal can only cause house value depreciation, ridiculous when there are other sites to build on which will have a much less impact!	- See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. - Property values are not considered material in planning law.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4464	Mr C Gordon				ADD04	Object	The proposed development of area ADD04 will lead to the loss of site that is both historic and lead to the loss of a natural beauty which should be preserved for this and many more future generations to enjoy. This site provides both recreational and educational spaces which benefit the whole of Biddulph in addition the erosion of the current boundaries will lead to the possible future development of the more green belt land and open country side which will further diminish the quality of life for the residents of Biddulph and will affect the habitat of the local wild life.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding historic impact and ecology. • See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact. • The sports pitches are not proposed for housing development.
PO4463	Mrs A Gordon				ADD04	Object	I am totally opposed to the proposed housing development on the Green belt land in Knypersley (area ADD04) especially when there are brown field sites that would be more suitable or short distance away which already have access off the Main Tunstall Road. The impact that this proposed development will have on the environment could never be reversed! I believe that it is our (the residents) + the SMDC duty to protect and safe guard the natural beauty of this area! The land under threat is a natural habitat for wild life, such as badgers, foxes and bats; all varieties of birds + the pools are a haven for ducks and geese, plus swan the destruction of the green belt land would be devastating!! Not counting the impact 150 – 250 houses to accommodate. We brought our house a number of years ago because of its views of the open countryside, we do not want to be overlooking a housing estate.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology and use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery. • See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact.
PO4462	Mrs J Johnson				ADD04	Object	Has the land between Brindley Ford and Chatterley Whitfield been considered for building? The land on the right hand side does not seem to have been used for anything; perhaps it would be unsuitable for housing. It is also on a bus route.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO4460	Mr R Bailey				ADD04	Object	Knypersley is good vicinity, over building will wreck this place builders pick these locations because of the pleasant area but soon turn it into urban sprawl, there's other places that can be improved by new builds and not out of place, if this went forward then Knypersley would have a unwanted blot on the landscape.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding landscape impact
PO4457	Mr R Mahan				ADD04	Object	I have lived in Knypersley for over 25 years during this time the increase in traffic has been terrible at times 10 -20 mins to get out of our drive. Due to the sheer volume of traffic as the infrastructure cannot cope with any more volume of the area new build is once at the max whacking routes to Knypersley Pool, the building of these houses will cause loss of wildlife area, we have loads of areas that could be used i.e. The Old Meadows School, Walf Road, Old Black Bull Pitt, why if we need another school if they can we not re-built Meadows School? The area is natural flood plain, into Chiscket Pool. S? Make house will cause more flooding to Main Road because the Drains cannot take cope.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery, infrastructure provision, schools and ecology. • See response to PO4485 regarding drainage.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4456	Mrs L Bayley				ADD04	Object	Too much over development we need these green spaces for people and wildlife to enjoy. Also traffic on the main road already bad at school times, and peak travel periods. Traffic congestion and parking? To drop off and pick. As far as I can see Bovis Homes cannot sell the houses already built other than to housing associations, which is not fit for local population.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • The Uplands Mill housing site has been taken into account in calculating Biddulph's housing needs.
PO4447	Mr M Hawker				ADD04	Object	Too much over development we need these green spaces for people and wildlife to enjoy. Also traffic on the main road already bad at school times, and peak travel periods.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4454	Mrs A Webster				ADD04	Object	I object to the proposed development because I have seen a lot of change in Biddulph over the last 40 years. It has gone from a lovely small village into a large town taking all the beautiful countryside with it. I live near the proposed site and walk this area daily as it is a peaceful place to be I struggle to cross the roads at busy times already due to the amount of parked cars. At busy times I can't get out of my drive safely. Please leave the remaining green belt for or wildlife which is very important.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact. • See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology.
PO4450	Mr T Blank				ADD04	Object	I feel that other proposed sites like to the west or even reclaimed land on (Chatterley Lane) should be the priority sites not green belt where there are other options. Also we have the feeling that a smallest development with soon grow into excessive, with no consideration given to the practicality and aesthetic aspects of development i.e. to many crammed into to narrow roads which immediately results in a unpleasant environment.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO4492	Mrs T Adams				ADD04	Object	We the people of Knypersley and Biddulph choose to live in this area for its outstanding beauty. I know that the people all over Knypersley and Biddulph are opposed to the number of homes proposed, and yes we are all trying our best to move them from our own immediate vicinity to somewhere else. It is a large amount of homes for this area and one has to wonder if they are needed given the fact that 200 homes already being built off Pennie Way are not selling. There is a lot of congestion around Knypesley due to there being 3 schools in close proximity. Developing around ADD04 (off Harlech Drive) will only add to the congestion. With heavy vehicles coming and going, we have to consider the impact to the area during the time of developing, the safety of children, and ask ourselves if there is a need for another school so close to the 3 we already have, and given the amount of homes planned this area of beauty will be eroded. I also feel it is not fair on the properties that overlook this land. People have brought these properties for the view and have paid a higher premium for this outlook (my own property does not over- look this area) and any development will now see their properties decrease in value. I feel it's not right. Would you be happy in this situation? I am in favour of land to the west of	• See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact. • See response to PO4456 regarding existing homes not selling. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4486 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO4468 regarding property values. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Victoria Business Park near to Brown Lees for development. As former open cast mining area I feel this makes more sense. It is far enough away from existing schools, has better access for vehicles therefore causing less disruption and congestion, and most importantly does not intrude on green belt land.	
PO4448	Mrs MD Jones				ADD04	Object	I object strongly to the erosion of the green belt land particularly when existing brownfield sites have not been utilised in the area. The proposal to possibly use this (ADD04) would not comply with building houses alone to the town centre of protect the flow of urban sprawl towards on the south side of the valley of Biddulph knypersley settlements when existing brownfield sites are available.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO4504	Mr C Davies				ADD04	Object	Why keep building on Green Belt land when less than 4 miles down the road are 3 sites which have been unused for years, Doultons old site in Burslem, H & R Johnson old site in Tunstall, and the unused cricket ground in Cell. Plus 150+ more cars using Knypersley traffic lights, the road can't cope now.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke and Newcastle Councils have their own development needs to meet. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4505	Mrs J Wright				ADD04	Object	We do not need any more congestion on our road it's bad enough when trying to get to and from school. It's an accident waiting to happen. We not got enough jobs for our community's it is, no more places at our local school for our children now having to go to 2 nd or 3 rd choices so what will happen when houses are built. More people more cars more children. It might bring more trade to Biddulph but doubt it as we've got empty shops but more than enough charity, hairdressing and funeral directors and no more news as us going to have anything else. Sainsbury's has done more harm than good in our town. Not given little shops a chance. No more houses needed.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • New employment land is proposed for allocation in Biddulph in the 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries' document. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding infrastructure provision. • New development creates numerous economic benefits. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4548	Mr D Finney				ADD04	Object	The nearby Knypersley Garden Centre has already been proposed as a future development for further housing whilst well has a significant effect on local resources and traffic flow with the area. The fields off Harlech Drive have become a haven for wildlife e.g. little owls have bred going over the years, Badgers, Fox regularly observed over the week along with Buzzard and Sparrow Hawkes. In the winter months the field have become a haven for the migrating bird's Field Fares and Red Wing's this development will significantly affect the above habitat. The road traffic during the hours of School opening and closing time in, Conway Road, Harlech Drive and Park Lane and gridlocked, making the access for emergency response vehicles extremely difficult and hazardous.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology.
PO4529	Mrs V Poole				ADD04	Object	The roads in the area are already congested and unsuitable to take more any further traffic. Traffic comes to a complete standstill in the week as a result of the pupils being driven to and from schools. There being 3 schools very close to each other. Park Lane and Conway Road are 'no go' areas for us at these times to avoid residents which often happen.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4528	Mr Loughlin				ADD04	Object	1) I cannot believe there are not more 'ugly' sites that could be developed first. 2) Mill Hayes, Colwyn Drive, Orme Road and Conway will probably Victoria Pool is bad enough at the minute with cars and poor roads surfaces. 3) Instead of thinking about new roads, how about repairing the existing ones. Park Lane lights and the 3 roundabouts heading towards Congleton are terrible. 4) Why does a new school need to be built when existing junior and senior school are in the immediate vicinity?	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • Road repairs are outside the jurisdiction of the Local Plan. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding schools.
PO4530	Mrs F Haynes				ADD04	Object	We moved here 5 years ago, because we (mainly!) wanted to end my days in peaceful scenery, the wild animals, and the lovely walks. Please no more houses or what was the point of it all?! And I'm sure we're not the only ones who have done the same.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. • See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact.
PO4531	Mrs A Johnson				ADD04	Object	The building at the St David's Way/Cornfield Road housing estate, in recent years as already had a negative impact on our environment. Increased and unsuitable types if traffic on our narrow lanes despite the signage for HGV's. An increase in the amount of dropped litter from the children walking from the high school to the new estates. Dog walkers neglecting to clean up after their mess around our streets rather than their own! Allowing the proposal to go ahead would defeat the object us buying our property in a quiet location, with easy access to the local countryside. The increase in traffic on Mill Hayes Road has made quite dangerous to walk to Knypersley Pool, as people like this route from Biddulph to avoid the cameras on Tunstall Road.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4486 regarding residential amenity.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4544 PO4508	Mr P Drummond Mrs J Drummond				ADD04	Object	We agree wholeheartedly with the observations set out in this document objecting to the development adjacent to Harlech Drive. We would however like to emphasise our own objections. The area, we assume, is Green Belt. As we understand if developments should not be allowed except in exceptional circumstances. Clearly these are not exceptional circumstances. Surely the emphasis should be on the retention of such areas. Once built upon such areas to be Green Belt again. The go ahead for further development would be a thin end of the wedge; it would give the amber light for the go ahead for further developments. This is very much akin to 'mission creep'. We would also like to put on paper our objections with reference to the access situation. Parking at the moment on Conway Road/Harlech Drive at school times presents problems. The grass areas adjacent to the aforementioned roads are already a mess, witness the situation at Park Lane end off Conway Road. We saw a similar situation to this, should the proposed development go ahead, where we lived previously. The road in question was close to a school drop off and pick up times the congestion situation made it very difficult to drive down the road. We would question the ability of certain emergency vehicles to gain access to the properties on the road. A similar situation would exist on Harlech Drive/Denbigh Close. The properties in Denbigh Close are mainly bungalows and the people living there are mainly elderly residents and the only access is via Harlech Drive.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4543 PO4542	Mrs J Salt Mr P Salt				ADD04	Object	Particular concern's regarding increased traffic to an additional school alongside existing High School, Middle School and Primary School	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4541	Mrs J Forster				ADD04	Object	The main thing I object to be the increase in traffic the roads and the surfaces, including the footpaths are in a terrible state at this moment so any additional will make it worse. Water pressure is below standard for the area. Parking of cars in the winter months is terrible because access will be via a steep incline and drivers will park at the top to get away from work it does happen at the moment at Park Lane roundabout from residents.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4528 regarding road surfaces.
PO4540	Mrs C Elms				ADD04	Object	I agree with all the above and would like to state that I am against any developments i.e.: school, housing in Knypersley area, especially on green belt. We already have traffic problems which will be made worse. More use should be made of existing site in Biddulph i.e. Mill Sites. The residents must be listened to.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4539	Mr G Elms				ADD04	Object	I object to any further development in the Knypersley area that will increase the congestion and parking of cars & buses. At the present we have four schools & a football & a cricket ground. They each contribute to parking on the roads including buses on Conway Road picking up and dropping off school children. Staffordshire Moorlands & Biddulph High School have a duty of care to residents & school children this is being ignored.	See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO4538	Mrs R Dale				ADD04	Object	I strongly object for the above reason and we have buzzards, newts, great crested adders, owl's, grass snakes, kestrels and bats. We have the servant quarters mature garden that has been here for nearly 200 years surrounded by trees with preservation orders on. People come to walk down the footpath down to the Knypersley reservoir.	See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology, footpaths and heritage impact.
PO4537	Mr A Dale				ADD04	Object	Proposed development would seriously increase the traffic and smoke/noise pollution to the current private access and garden areas to my home and neighboring houses, my concerns are my children, which one has asthma and the dangers of vehicle traffic, which is the main reason that myself and my family live here, also i have pets which is another reason that we live here. To keep Knypersley remaining green areas. Also to protect the valley from development for our future generations to enjoy.	- See response to PO4486 regarding highways. - If the district council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality.
PO4536	Mrs F Nicosia				ADD04	Object	Biddulph is often described as a historic town. I do not feel as though this sentiment is carried forward and considered thoroughly when decisions such as new housing are made. There is no doubt that new houses are needed in an ever evolving and ever increasing society and town as such as Biddulph sites are few and far between and as such more and more green belt site are being sacrificed. In this situation is due to the unique nature of Biddulph and its environment. It's a rural town, surrounded by areas of natural beauty such as the Peak District, the Cheshire Plains and the Moorlands. There are environment ramifications of this proposal as have been eloquently listed/outlined in the proposal against that plan. What concern me are not just the environmental ramifications such as the loss of the habitats and the hedgerows. But now such a plan would impact on the quality of living adjacent to this plan. The proposal itself will have reduced the quality of life of some residents already. Uncertainty in what will happen to their homes, what will the traffic impact be, what will the noise pollution be like, what will the light pollution do? Questions that would not be on the mind of the occupants of their house when the purchased their properties. Homes to the land at the back of the properties would have been appealing or	- See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology, landscape impact and heritage impact. - Wherever possible hedgerows would be incorporated into any future development scheme. - See response to PO4486 regarding residential amenity. - See response to PO4486 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							deciding from when I purchased the house. Land that they have watched grow during the spring and during the winter and come back again. What changes could be made to their home without their consent. Historically, the area has evidence rife with promise undiscovered promise of giving an insight into our ancestors, families even who occupied then are previously to learn from the past, we need to find it, catalogue and interpret it this chance will not be given if it is built over it a shame more consideration has not been demonstrated, it seems our duty to cover it up again but to uncover it learn from it and add more to the historic content of Biddulph.	
PO4535	Mr M Kelly				ADD04	Object	I, my parents, my children and my grandchildren, have enjoyed walks in this area for years. To watch the varied wildlife has been a pleasure for the whole family as have our bat watch! Please do not destroy this community loving area in our green belt.	• See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. • See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt.
PO4534	Mrs G Hancock				ADD04	Object	I object because I live on Tunstall Road and the traffic is already extremely heavy. Conway Road is also a main thoroughfare to the only High School in Biddulph. This road is not accessible in winter due to the gradient and lack of gritting. I also object as the views and natural habitat will be totally destroyed. Why not build on ugly brown sites in the town?	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4481 regarding visual impact. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO4533	Mr K Hancock				ADD04	Object	Congestion Access Natural Habitat Infrastructure Destroy what is a natural green belt beautiful view. Drainage It will devastate the view from Knypersley Cricket Club which is acknowledged as one of the beautiful settings in Staffordshire Cricket League.	• See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology and infrastructure provision. • See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4485 regarding drainage.
PO4532	Mr B Goodwin				ADD04	Object	I have recognition that there is a considerable housing demand in the area. However, the plans to build this number of houses of Conway Road seems poorly conceived as from the perceptions of someone who as a local resident for many years. This said if the numbers were reduced to less than 50 I feel support would increase.	• The Council is looking at ways of minimizing Green Belt development.
PO4519	Miss G Bestwick				ADD04	Object	It saddens me greatly to hear that the council have chosen so many green belt sites as potential locations for housing. Unfortunately, it appears the notion of Biddulph as the Garden Town of Staffordshire is going to become something of the past and not the future. With regards to the proposal of a new school on the site the roads surrounding Park Lane and Conway Road are already difficult to navigate at school time with Knypersley first, James Batemen and the high school. To add more traffic to this already congested area would be bad for our children and young families.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4516	Mrs E Stubbs				ADD04	Object	I feel as though the lovely green field should stay green not a lot houses, it has stayed since we came here, and we don't want it to alter any more.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt.
PO4514	Mr C Toft				ADD04	Object	This is proposed building on green belt land, which should be preserved and not built upon. It is proposed to be built around listed property which would spoil the historic integrity. Also, the traffic through Conway Road/Harlech Drive is heavy enough without more. The extra traffic would cause absolute chaos, particularly on Harlech Drive – and high peak times it is difficult enough to get of Conway Road onto Tunstall Road. Plus, the infrastructure in place in Biddulph is just not enough to sustain another housing estate the size of that proposed.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding heritage impact and infrastructure provision.
PO4513	Mrs A Harrison				ADD04	Object	I object to the proposed building on green belt site. These need to be protected. Also I object to where the access roads will be sited as it will cause chaos on Harlech Drive and Conway Road. Plus I believe the current infrastructure will be unable to maintain so many new buildings.	• See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding infrastructure provision.
PO4512	Mrs K Saltwell				ADD04	Object	Another school site could be where the Meadow School was until it recently burnt down – It is next to sports fields Mill Hayes Road is already dangerous to use and HGV trucks still use it even though there is only wide enough for one vehicle at a time in some places.	• Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). • See response to PO4486 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4511	Mr R Rowland-Brough				ADD04	Object	In addition to the very well researched bullet points which form part of the basis of my objection, I would like to bring the following points to your attention. The only notice relating to the proposed development at ADD04 is located on a wooden plate on the dirt track of Knypersley Hall. Given this location, unless you happen to walk on the footpath, the vast majority of residents in the surrounding area would be generally none the wiser for the plans. This was confirmed when talking to friends and neighbours who live at various locations overlooking ADD04. I find it hard to describe this action so maybe I should leave it with very convenient. Although this notice may fill with the requirements of the planning regulations, I know for certain it provided no opportunity to residents in the wider area who would be affected therefore a convenient way to cheat the good hearted people of Knypersley out of green open space that they believed was protected green belt. A quick fix for the first 150 houses? Given the location of the site ADD04 and the proposals for the site I would suggest that the planning department have not made any effort to visit the site or any other in the area. The references to the (NPPF) are already noted on the bullet point list 1-4. I would suggest that the planning department have failed totally to operate within their own guidelines. As such I believe that this site ADD04 should be removed permanently from the proposals. The green belt land which forms site ADD04 has features related to Knypersley Hall which is a listed building. The former park lands of the hall having been undisturbed for many years have formed a natural nature reserve for the birds and wildlife complimented by the mature trees. To destroy this for the purpose of housing would be an atrocity for which the SMDC planning department should be ashamed given the alternative brown field sites available. This site is currently home to a variety of birds including Grey Herons, Buzzards and more notably Oystercatcher have been observed in the summer months, not to mention Bats, Squirrels, Rabbits. The birdlife shares naturally beautiful and tranquil environment with the likes of planners, they are an irreplaceable feature of this area, should it be developed and would most likely perish. Given the sensitivity of some of the site proposed around Knypersley and Biddulph, the planning department should consider the sites proposed in far greater detail and within the NPPF guidelines. In all cases, they should consider the sites and make detailed consideration and research before even reaching the initial proposals stage. Road Access – The current traffic level in Conway Road far exceeds its original purpose. The additional traffic at school times makes use of the road extremely dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike. It is generally not easy to park outside properties without causing an obstruction. With further traffic and parking issues created by	• The site notice as a means of informing the public about a potential site allocation was put in place in addition to other measures such as delivering flyers to all residents in the District so it was not the only way to find out about the Council's consultation. • See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding ecology and landscape impact. • See response to PO4536 regarding loss of hedgerows. • If development takes place on this site any protected trees would be preserved unless there are exceptional circumstances in which case re-planting would be required. Soft landscaping would be integrated into any scheme. • See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding heritage impact, use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery. • See response to PO4486 regarding highways. • See response to PO4512 regarding schools.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							events at local schools, the road can become grid locked causing problems for the school buses and on occasion has impeded the access for ambulance. The road becomes quickly impassable during falling snow and remains icy for long periods afterward as the storm grids lower section of the road are blocked solid with rubble and have been for a considerable time. To consider imposing the additional traffic flow proposed development would create, is in my opinion ludicrous given the already crumbling road. Schools - With respect to the proposed School on development ADD04 I fail to see the purpose of an additional primary School given the current primary schools. It would appear however to have been overlooked that the area only has one High School which has no further availability. General Impact – The impact of the proposed developments would lead to the loss of identity for the area and merge the small villages into Biddulph and as a whole we would be soon be living in a small city.	
PO4555	Mr and Mrs A Alcock				ADD04	Object	As an alternative site can we suggest land alongside the road leading from Mill Hayes Garage towards the recycling centre?	See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Bemersley area.
PO4638	Mr E Case				ADD04	Object	I object to the proposed development of 150-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley for reasons which are explained on the attached sheets.	Comments noted.
PO4656	Mrs A Case				ADD04	Object	I object to the proposed development of 100-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley for the reasons explained above.	Comments noted.
PO4655	Mr Tipper				ADD04	Object	I object to the proposed development of 100-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley for the reasons explained above.	Comments noted.
PO4449	Mrs J Garner				ADD04	Object	I object strongly to the erosion of the green belt land particularly when existing brownfield sites have not been utilised in the area. The proposal to possibly use this (ADD04) would not comply with building houses alone to the town centre of protect the flow of urban sprawl towards on the south side of the valley of Biddulph knypersley settlements when existing Knypersley has a lot of traffic problems we do already have 3 schools in the area.	- See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. - See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding use of brownfield sites including Victoria Colliery.
PO6262	Mr N Lunt				ADD04	Object	This site is Green Belt + would result in building in front of a historic building. Access roads are totally unsuitable to this site.	- See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt. - See response to PO4283 (at the beginning of this table) regarding heritage impact. - See response to PO4486 regarding highways.
PO9707	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				ADD04	Object	Object to adjustment of Green Belt boundary to include this site.	See response to PO4554 regarding loss of Green Belt.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6493	Mr Gilbert Bradley				ADD04	Object	I object	Comment noted.
PO6348	Mr N Lunt							
PO6807	Mr M Owen							
PO6928	Mrs J Brennan							
PO8516	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8480	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO8458	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO8058	Mr B Hyde							
PO8019	Mr N Goode							
PO8036	Mr K Parry							
PO8000	Mrs A Brown							
PO7978	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7233	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7191	Mr A Nixon							
PO7172	Mrs G Hall							
PO7842	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7862	Mr H Whalley							
PO7426	Mr J Banister							
PO8847	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8874	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO7898	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7923	Mr J Swindell							
PO8599	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8670	Mr A Malbon							
PO8711	Mr R Willott							
PO8790	Mr S Holdcroft							
PO8243	Mr P Kelly							
PO8974	Mrs P Hindmarsh							
PO8355	Mr N Mosson							
PO8335	Mrs S Bennett							
PO8561	Mr R Scales							
PO8580	Mrs J Scales							
PO7875	Mrs J Banister							
PO7876	Mrs J Banister							
PO7760	Mr R Bradbury							
PO5543	Mrs M Moffatt							
PO7081	Mr C Kisicki							
PO6593	Mrs Beverley Holding							
PO6551	Mrs Ann James							
PO6199	Mrs Alison Wickstead							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7048	Mr and Mrs B Carter							
PO6434	Mr Paul Malkin							
PO6828	Mr D Wickstead							
PO5620	Mr A Barbeard							
PO6967	Mr K Allen							
PO5503	Mr M Cook							
PO6088	Mr I Frisby							
PO6104	Mr D Cantrill							
PO6123	Mrs J Frisby							
PO6141	Mrs J Collier							
PO6160	Mr K Collier							
PO5720	Mrs D Whalley							
PO5759	Mr J Hammond							
PO5914	unknown							
	unknown							
	unknown							
PO5865	Mr and Mrs G. Freeman							
PO5649	M Mitchell							
PO6007	Mrs L Price							
PO794	Mrs Jayne Beech				ADD04	Support	I support the inclusion of ADD04 in the proposal.	Comment noted.
PO1023	Mr G Cooper				ADD04	Support	Seems a obvious area to remove from the green belt along with BD117	Comment noted.
PO730	Mr Philip Beech				ADD04	Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5602	Mr Lewis Williams							
PO5843	Mr Carl Mason							
PO5744	Mrs Eileen Smith							
PO5821	Mr Christopher Slater							
PO6054	Mr Reg Grimwood							
PO5698	Mr Jason Eardley							
PO5800	Mr Stephen Clowes							
PO6659	Ms Heather Mason							
PO6455	Mr Norman Smith							
PO6570	Mr Jeffrey Leese							
PO6679	Mrs J M Slater							
PO5780	Mr E Pearl							
PO5586	Mrs S Wilshaw							
PO5566	Mr R Wilshaw							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5394	Mrs S Harper							
PO5440	Mrs K Hallam							
PO6034	Mr T Barker							
PO7018	Mrs D Stuttard							
PO5529	Mr N Moxon							
PO5486	Mrs L Cook							
PO5472	Mrs J Moxon							
PO6907	Mr M Mason							
PO6887	Mr G Mason							
PO6853	Mrs I Latta							
PO6069	Mr R Blood							
PO5375	Mr S Leese							
PO6640	Mr Ronald Bailey							
PO6613	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO7394	Mr and Mrs D P Pass							
PO7336	Ms Emma Eardley							
PO6414	Mr P Squires							
PO6473	Mr K Rowland							
PO6702	Mrs D Cook							
PO6247	Mrs S Goodwin							
PO6400	Mr B Wilson							
PO8275	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO8134	Ms Barbara Griffiths							
PO8430	R Hutton							
PO7938	Mr C Kirkham							
PO8497	Miss L Delves							
PO8155	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8189	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8170	Mrs AngelaTurner							
PO7541	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs							
PO8099	Mr K Davies							
PO7811	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg							
PO7264	Mr A Weston							
PO7570	Mrs G Weston							
PO8735	mr Stephen Willott							
PO8755	Mrs Maureen							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site ADD04)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8918	Whitehurst							
	Mr and Mrs I							
PO8209	Condcliffe							
PO8937	Mr D Smith							
	Mr and Mrs G							
	Bowyer							
PO8228	Mrs P Kelly							
PO7801	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8294	Mr R Cook							
PO8541	Mr D Neal							
PO8408	Mr G Price							
PO7960	Mr A Lehepoo							
PO8962	Mr C Goodwin							
PO9674	Mrs P Hancock							
PO9857	Mr Gayle							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5199	Mr Peter Brittain				BD062	General comment	Please balance the town geographically.	Comment noted.
PO5136	Mr Gary Harding				BD062	General comment	Biddulph bypass benefits Biddulph building on the west side.	Comment noted.
PO5181 PO5189	Mr J. Denton Mrs A Denton				BD062	General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comment noted.
PO4864	mr allan knapper				BD062	Object	This site should remain included in the green belt within Biddulph and not taken out for development.	Comment noted.
PO5122	Ms Lynne Evans				BD062	General comment	Biddulph North requires a neighbourhood plan to balance out the already developed north east Biddulph sites. The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comment noted.
PO5125	Ms Lynne Evans				BD062	General comment	The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comment noted.
PO5110	Mr Cottrell				BD062	Object	Where ever we build in Biddulph Green Belt will be used Brown Field Sites should be used first until these have been used Victoria Colliery Site and if building is to be done then this should be and is suitable to use.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD062 for release from the Green Belt. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. - Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD062. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO4950	Mr M Owen				BD062	General comment	My opinion is that in today's climate we continue to keep building anywhere and not understanding problems that are caused afterwards.	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5078	Mr J Neate				BD062	General comment	As stated above the level of homes in Biddulph area is at a saturated level. Moving west makes much more sense.	Comment noted.
PO5161	Mr N McQuade				BD062	General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comment noted.
PO178	Mr Kingsley Rowland				BD062	Object	I think this site should remain included in the green belt within Biddulph and not taken out for development.	Comment noted.
PO4963	Mr Stephen Willott				BD062	Object	Sewage works since the land owner decimated the site in December 2015; we are plagued with sewage smells: This never occurred before. Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor feeder roads (Essex Drive/York Close) meet the minimum STD for the SCC highways design guide policy. To narrow and bend radii is too small. Plus 2 pinch points on Mow Lane, only recently a (20 th May) a bad accident happened needing the police to attend. Community access – the local community have an unfettered access to this site since 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access to this, used by local residents. This land should be designated as a visual open space. Bio diversity – the phase 1 habitat survey stated that this site was not recommended for development it is the only site in Biddulph where this was stated is why the landowner decided to try to destroy the habitat and allowed to get away with it	• United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. An odour assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that the site could be developed without adverse impact on future residents. A noise assessment has not been undertaken as the developer does not consider this to be necessary. • The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a Transport Assessment. • The land is privately owned and has a footpath across it linking to Biddulph Valley Way. If this site were to be developed, the developer would be required to maintain a public access on to the Biddulph Valley Way. • The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016). Local Green Space supersedes the Visual Open Space designation (which is an old designation not supported by Government policy in the NPPF). • The Council's Phase 1 Habitat consultants consider the site habitats to be of nature conservation value at district level and have the potential to support bats and reptiles, which could allow the consideration of the site as an SBI or BAS. Further survey work would need to take place prior to any development to establish Site of Biological Importance (SBI) / Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS). Prior to any development an assessment would be required of the 2 trees for their potential to support roosting bats and a reptile survey.
PO4936	Ms Diane Copeland				BD062	Object	There is plenty of land at Brown Lees waiting to be built on. Our infrastructure won't cope with the housing and the sewage	• See response to PO5110 regarding Victoria Colliery / Childerplay.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							works, who would want to live here anyway with the stench.	- National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works.
PO5157	Mrs C. Nicholls				BD062	Object	I do not believe that building should take place on Green Belt but understand that the town needs to produce a neighbourhood plan to achieve the objections set by the government I would suggest that the land that has been more recently been designated as Green Belt should be used like Childerplay Road + the Victoria Colliery site.	See response to PO5110 regarding Victoria Colliery / Childerplay.
PO4965	Mrs Joan Draisey				BD062	Object	Proximity of the sewage works is already working over capacity population. Incidents already of raw sewage flooding, odour. Access roads too narrow. Coming out of Essex Drive onto Mow Lane already is a danger. Green Belt slowly being eroded varied wildlife at risk. Increase in the amount of cars in the cul de sac impacts on the children's safety.	- See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO4963 regarding ecology.
PO329	Mr Dave Boothroyd				BD062	Object	Green Belt Review. Land adjacent to the Sewage works. I oppose any suggestion that areas BD068, BD087 and BD062 should be designated as possible areas for development or that their Green Belt status be changed. In view of recent correspondence with United Utilities, suggesting strongly that development should not take place adjacent to wastewater treatment (sewage) works on the grounds of environmental health concerns of problems with smells and noise, it is clear that these areas must never be built upon. I quote from their message, made in a letter dated 26 th May 2016: - "We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works." It is possible, of course, that local land-owners may wish	- See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. - The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. - The site boundary can be amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2 at the request of the landowner, who does not own this land and is not promoting it for development. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							to sell their land for development outside the current Housing Allocation scheme. The planning officers would have to oppose the granting on planning permission on the above grounds. If these areas were firmly designated as Green Belt, the planning authorities would find the refusal of planning permission a far easier case to argue if the Green Belt status is maintained. Wildlife Habitat: - I refer to the Wildlife Habitat Survey on behalf of SMDC of 2014. http://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/pages/Front%20Cover%2C%20Introduction%2C%20Appendices.pdf This survey gives scientific and quantitative support to the everyday observation that the areas are a thriving wildlife habitat. The destruction of habitat is a most undesirable development. In particular, the gully and hedgerow that crosses the field BD068 is home to rabbits, foxes and badgers, many species of bird, including the rare Jay and Kestrel. Insect and plant species are plentiful and varied. Hedgerows along the brook side and the Gillow Heath/Congleton Road footpath are similarly species rich. Any aerial view of these areas clearly show that development on these areas will tend to break the wildlife corridor that links the Biddulph area with the ancient woodland areas on Baileys Bank (site of the former Biddulph Castle) and on Congleton Edge. This is bad because it threatens genetic diversity in plant and animal species by restricting the range of habitats. Agriculture: - Two of the three areas are active, productive farmland. Area BB068 in particular is being maintained and improved by the current farming tenants. The grass is fertilised, the weeds suppressed, and the land is used currently to raise two dozen heifers. It can not be dismissed as low quality pasture land. Flooding: - It must be accepted that the areas under discussion have been, recently, in the past, and probably for the indefinite future, subject to flooding. According to the Environment Agency, open green land adjacent to watercourses is the only viable solution to the problem of mitigating the damage to property in the area. Green Belt status is a sensible approach to keeping flood-prone areas available to fulfil the role of 'flood plain'	
PO6725	Master Joey Turner				BD062	Object	Please do not let them build on the field at the end of my road (ref. site BD062) because we make dens there and we play in our street and do not want to get ran over. The stream is very near and I like the nature and animals in the field.	Comments noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6726	Ms Kerris Farr				BD062	Object	Regarding site ref: BD062 as a resident of Gillow Heath for nearly 30yrs I am so upset by the plans to use the proposed site for development. I use the footpath adjacent to the site everyday whilst walking my dog. It is bad enough that someone came along a few months ago and cut all the trees and shrubs down. Not taking into consideration the beautiful wildlife that lives there rabbits, badgers, foxes and birds too numerous to mention, and that you can see 'every time' you walk there. Green spaces are getting few and far between these days and to build on this small but beautiful patch of land is a crime, some people have got no hearts and money seems to be at the top of their priority list I bet. If the plans do get passed I hope that potential home owners take 5 minutes to stay and smell the putrid odour of the water works that the houses will be backing onto.	• See response to PO4963 regarding loss of footpath. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works.
PO9705	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				BD062	Object	Object to adjustment of Green Belt boundary to include this site. The site has significant highway, drainage, ecology, odour and other constraints which local people will require the LPA to address.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works.
PO9671	Mrs P Hancock				BD062	Object	Access (Mow Lane) is too narrow.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO9956	Mr C Lunt				BD062	Object	BD062 should remain in the Green Belt and not taken out for development.	Comment noted.
PO9981	Mr Ray Lloyd				BD062	Object	(Summary) Site BD062 has special environmental qualification to Green Belt Protection because of its progressions towards a wildlife sanctuary. It is a national cycleway with an open aspect and crucial to Biddulph wishin to develop tourism. This site would be better cared for as a small woodland. Lots of wildlife present on the site.	• See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • The BVW is a very significant attribute in the town and part of a national Sustrans cycle route. Therefore any development in the area would be built around it. The route is generally buffered by trees and hedgerows. All new development bordering the route would be required to provide pedestrian and cycle links on to it. The Council has produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy and the BVW is identified within this document. It is not considered that development in this location would impact on the enjoyment of the route and long ranging views (e.g. to Mow Cop) and the wider countryside would remain.
PO9953	Mr T Green				BD062	Object	Object to the site being taken out of the Green Belt for development.	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO812	Mr Timothy Sproston				BD062	Object	I do not feel that changes should be made to the greenbelt status site BD062 reasons as follows. The Phase 1 habitat Survey conducted by Lockwood Hall Associates conducted (2014) stated; that the site 'FID122, is significant because of the range of wildlife and habitats it provides. The section realted specifically to Site BD062 concluded (p.276 of 382) that, "the site has potential for protected species due to the mosiac of habitats and habitat structure especially as the site is well connected to the mider countryside. Therefore the site is not recommended for potential development as the site is deemed to have district ecological importance". I am not an expert in the area of ecology, however Consultants have given their opinion. Despite this (and the recommendation that further surveys be carried out) representatives of the land owner have been (Dec 2015) and caused damage. They used tractors and heavy machinery to bring down trees and remove vegetation, in doing so thay disturbed the habit of many of the species specified in the Survey. Local residents has had unfettered community access to site BD062 for circa 40 years and we have photographic evidence of parties being held there in the 1970s. The use of this green space has continued daily to this present day for a variety of recreational activities.	• See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding loss of resident's access to land.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO377	Mr Peter Turner				BD062	Object	The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “... the site is not recommended for potential development ...” It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy , which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. “ The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site . The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings). The site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the Species Rich	• See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next Preferred Options consultation. • If development takes place on this site any protected trees would be preserved unless there are exceptional circumstances in which case re-planting would be required. Soft landscaping would be integrated into any scheme. • If the site is developed hedgerows would be retained within the scheme layout wherever possible. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • Site BD062 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • No contradiction with SMDC Core Strategy Policy SS5b ‘Biddulph Area Strategy’. Sites within the urban area and an extension to the urban area are included as well as extensions in the Green Belt identified as part of the Green Belt Review as stated in the policy. • See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area , where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is “ ... very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site.” This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed...”will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk...” The site is in Flood Zone 2 The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the new development as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. Improvement works to the adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development.	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO560	Mrs Angela Turner				BD062	Object	Where viable land is identified elsewhere in the District which is NOT classed as Green Belt this should be prioritised over removing land from the Green Belt in Biddulph. The figure of 20% has not be based on the land available in different areas and the presumption that land can simply be reclassified, removed from the Green Belt and put into the Town Boundary is both wrong and shows no understanding of the true definition of 'Sustainable Development'. This approach is extremely unsustainable when non- Green Belt sites are available elsewhere in the District.	It is agreed that non-green belt land should be used for development first and this approach has been used in Biddulph. However, there is not enough land to meet Biddulph's housing needs without Green Belt land. The proportion of 20% of the District's housing development taking place in Biddulph has been through extensive consultation and public examination as it is taken from the Council's Core Strategy which was adopted in March 2014.
PO4951	Mr D Wickstead				BD062	Object	Major concern for me is the traffic increase on Mow Lane this is an incident waiting to happen if the increase goes ahead some decision making councillor will be ultimately responsible for some innocent person's death.	See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO4932	Mrs M Moffatt				BD062	Object	Too near sewage works can be smelt in Mow Lane. Mow Lane is totally unsuitable for any more traffic no pavements for pedestrian's dangerous bends over 2 bridges are safe? Mow Lane is unsuitable for the Contractors Lorries. You should not be able to use green belt which always was protected.	- See response to PO4963 regarding the close proximity of the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt.
PO4979	Mrs L Goodwin				BD062	Object	Essentially the town boundary should remain "as is", Green Belt was designed as such for a reason i.e. not to build upon.	See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt.
PO4973	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg				BD062	Object	Inadequate road access Encroachment on public recreational space Disruption to the wildlife corridor/habitat Proximity to sewage works causing a risk to the public's health Most of the roads in Gillow Heath do not have pavements. Increased traffic will increase the hazard to pedestrians.	- See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO4963 regarding loss of resident's access to land. - See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. - See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works.
PO4972	Miss L Siddorn				BD062	Object	Roads are unsuitable/sewage works	- See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works.
PO4971	Mr J Swindell				BD062	Object	This plot of land should remain Green Belt and used to improve/expand the sewage works as these works struggle with the volume of sewage from this current capacity of housing. The smell from these works forces me to keep my windows closed if the wind direction is from the NE. I am a frequent walker in this area and is a home to a variety of wildlife (owls, badgers, goldfinch. rabbits) not to mention the vast array of wild plants and flowers. The supporting roads leading to this plot cannot cope with the current traffic demands. The conditions of the roads are very poor and in some places there are very poor and in some places there are no pavements to separate pedestrians from oncoming traffic. Development should be focused on empty buildings and sites that have been previously used for commercial purposes, rather than consuming the small areas of open spaces that are enjoyed by the community and provide a platform for the younger generation to learn about and	- See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. - See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO5110 regarding use of brownfield sites. - See response to PO4963 regarding loss of resident's access to land. - See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space. - See response to PO377 regarding perceived contradiction with the Core Strategy.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							appreciate nature.	
PO574	Miss Louise Richardson				BD062	Object	The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “... the site is not recommended for potential development ...” It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy , which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. “ The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site . The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings). The site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the	• See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO377 regarding the Green infrastructure strategy. • See response to PO377 regarding loss of trees and hedgerows. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO377 regarding community contribution. • See response to PO377 regarding perceived contradiction with the Core Strategy. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space. • See response to PO4963 regarding loss of resident’s access to land.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the Species Rich Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area , where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is “ ... very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site.” This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed...”will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk... “ The site is in Flood Zone 2 The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the new development as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. The local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built in 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space , protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. Three well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land. Provision of community enjoyment of countryside and open spaces is supported by the Commons Act 2006.	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO950	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				BD062	Object	The proposed development site BD062 is semi rural Green Belt land and the impact of any development on the surrounding area would be great. The Essex Drive and York Close estate which borders the site was originally open farm land prior to the houses construction in approximately 1971. After the houses were constructed, the remaining part of the site was listed as Green Belt land, and continued to be used for the grazing of animals until the early 1980's. At this point extensive construction activity was undertaken on the Biddulph sewage works site, and pipes were laid across site BD062, including some above surface level. Since this construction activity, the site has been left to nature as Green Belt land with no agricultural use or maintenance works undertaken on site. The site is one of the few areas of land in Biddulph that has been left untended to allow nature to thrive. There is now a good range of wildlife and plant life on the site, despite the site owners attempt to destroy the sites natural habitats in December 2015. The site acts as a break between Gillow Heath and the wider Biddulph area across the main road (A527), and has the additional benefit of screening the sewage works. Previous applications Site BD062 was previously subject to a planning application in the early 1990's (circa 1991). The application was rejected due to a number of issues with the site, all of these issues still exist today, yet the 'Site Assessment Form' now states that the site is potentially suitable for residential development. The original issues included the Green Belt status of the land, proximity to the sewage works with associated nuisances (odour and noise), pipe work laid across the site, and restricted access to site BD062 via Mow Lane and either Essex Drive or York Close. Grounds for objection to site development at BD062: 1. Proximity to sewage works and public health During the Local Plan process local residents have made numerous enquires to United Utilities concerning the sewage works / waste water treatment works at Marsh Green Road in Biddulph. The site currently processes the sewage for nearly all Biddulph residents. 1.1. Correspondence with United Utilities Issues raised by residents include the sewage processing capacity of the site, with concerns raised regarding the extra pressure generated by nearly 1,100 new homes, noise from site operations, odours emitted from the site, and sewer overflow with the consequential pollution of Biddulph Brook. Additionally, we now understand that Biddulph Grange Gardens and neighbouring housing developments at the Grange are soon to be connected to the sewage works system. Consequently, reducing the sewage works current ability to accommodate new housing developments in the town. United Utilities have stated in two separate items of correspondence with residents: " We have held a recent discussion with officers at the local planning	• See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances. • United Utilities infrastructure exists on the site and if the site is developed the developer would be required to work with United Utilities to reach an appropriate solution. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • Screening would be required as part of any new development. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO377 regarding the Green infrastructure strategy. • See response to PO377 regarding loss of trees and hedgerows. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO377 regarding community contribution. • See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space. • See response to PO377 regarding perceived contradiction with the Core Strategy.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							authority and Councillor Court regarding the emerging development plan and specifically discussed the proposed new housing near to the wastewater treatment works ." (United Utilities Reference: TH/CAS16-0031-0912 & CAS16-0031-7878) " In undertaking an assessment of which sites are most suitable, we feel it is appropriate to highlight to local planning authorities the proximity of sites near to wastewater treatment works. We have explained that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that maybe available to them ." (United Utilities Reference: TH/CAS16-0031-0912) United Utilities clearly stated in correspondence: " The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works ." (United Utilities Reference: TH/CAS16-0031-0912 & CAS16-0031-7878) Any housing development on sites adjoining Biddulph sewage works would constrain the sewage works operation, and potentially have a serious impact on United Utilities ability to undertake future upgrade/expansion works to their site, to accommodate additional housing in Biddulph. The developers draft site plan (submitted to SMDC in 2015) shows houses placed only 15 metres away from pumping equipment on the sewerage works site, which is in operation 24 hours a day. However, site BD062 remains in the SMDC Local Plan. 1.2. SMDC planning policy Development of site BD062 contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. " The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance ." SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4. 1.3. Pollution and nuisance Local residents on Essex Drive, York Close, Long Valley Road and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes from noise, odour and flooding from raw sewage discharge. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes the Biddulph Brook. The sewage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							the manhole covers. This sewage then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes located near to the end of Essex Drive). This has happened on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when either United Utilities or the Environment Agency cleared the pollution from Biddulph Brook. Further to this, the Environment Agency instructed United Utilities to attend site BD062 on Friday 13 May 2016, and undertake a clear up of materials discharged from the overflowing sewer junction box (Call reference 1434712). Photographs of materials were provided to the Environment Agency at the time, with the Environment Agency reporting back that United Utilities undertook a litter pick of the site. 1.4. Odours Residents in Gillow Heath (Essex Drive, York Close, Long Valley Road, Marsh Green Road) have repeatedly contacted United Utilities, Severn Trent, Environment Agency, and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Regrettably, the numerous reports by residents over the years to different authorities and agencies have not been consolidated into a single reporting mechanism. United Utilities have also admitted to having no records of resident's previous reports when they were followed up. The site owner paid for a survey which stated: " the vast majority of the site immediately adjacent to the works is suitable for residential use ." Residents would ask when this assessment was undertaken, and why it contradicts the correspondence received from United Utilities above, who suggested SMDC discuss the site with their Environmental Health Officers. It is notable to residents that the odours emitted from the sewage works site are at their strongest during the summer months. The United Utilities engineers who visited site BD062 to undertake a cleanup in May 2016 stated: " it will always smell when it is hot and sunny ", " when it next rains the smell should go away ". Building houses on site BD062, which are even closer to the sewage works than existing housing will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in incidents under the statutory nuisance regime. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 applies to the sewage works site, Section 79(1) of the act concerns 'Statutory Nuisances', including issues prejudicial to health, including smells emitted from industrial/trade/business premises, and noise emitted from a premises. The application of this legislation to a sewage works site was confirmed in a High Court decision from 2003 – Hounslow London Borough Council v Thames Water Utilities Ltd [2003] All ER (D) 347 (May) . The proceedings were commenced as Hounslow London Borough Council were concerned with the odour emitted from a sewage treatment works, as having a	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							detrimental impact on the quality of the local environment for those living close by. Development on site BD062 contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: “The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is “appropriate for its location” in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 1.5. Noise Construction activity on the Biddulph sewage works site in 2012 required a planning permission application to SMDC, with permission granted on 7 th June 2012 (Application Number: SM.12/02/153 W). The planning application process included consultation with residents who objected, raising concerns regarding noise from the site. Within the ‘Permission For Development’ document dated 7 th June 2012, The ‘Notification For Applicants’ section states “ Concern was raised by a local resident regarding noise. The residents property is located over 160 metres to the east of the site’s boundary and over 200 metres to the east of the proposed kiosks. The nearest residential properties are located over 60 metres to the West. ” The nearest properties described above are actually located on Long Valley Road, the other side of a disused railway embankment, now used as a National Cycle Route 55. The owner of site BD062 commissioned an architect who produced a draft site plan, that shows the nearest houses to sewage site equipment being less than 15 metres away. Therefore, it is obvious that the residents of any new housing on site BD062 would experience disruption caused by the sewage works from both odours and noise. 1.6. Sewage works capacity The United Utilities sewage treatment works site in Biddulph is reported as having the capacity to serve a population equivalence of 17,000 residents (figure taken from a professional journal published by a United Utilities Senior Process Engineer). The population of Biddulph at the 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of nearly 1,100 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this facility. United Utilities have stated: “ We will be closely monitoring the impact on our assets as development takes place to see how they perform and consider the need to invest at the most appropriate time. ” (United Utilities Reference: TH/CAS16-0031-0912). This investment will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Should site BD062 be built on, any future development work or expansion required at the sewage works site, or with associated pipe works, would be severely constrained with construction on site BD062. This may prevent	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							the development of larger housing schemes in Biddulph and their connection to the sewage system. The Biddulph sewerage works site is compact and it would be unable to expand to the West or the South, as site BD062 adjoins these boundaries of the site. The Eastern boundary of the site is the Biddulph Brook, and to the North the ground is wet marshland. In conclusion, the presence of the sewage works site adjoining the development site, would suggest that this site should only be developed as a last option for Biddulph, due to environmental impacts and potentially negative impact on larger developments within the town. 2. Habitats and biodiversity The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “ the site is not recommended for potential development ”. It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded in the habitat survey information that was adopted by the Council, and that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. 2.1. Environmental policy Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. “ The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets ” SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 The inclusion of BD062 contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. BD062 inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The site is within the Species Rich	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan area, where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on the site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. This site has the potential to deliver both of these aims. Protecting and enhancing this site would help to deliver the aims of SMDC Local Plan Policy NE1 Natural Environment regarding the protection and improvement of the countryside and biodiversity, and identification of sites suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings). The Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd, Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is “ very well connected to other bio diverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site ”. This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. 2.2. Phase 1 Habitat Reports Two Phase 1 Habitat Surveys exist for this site. In addition to the SMDC survey carried out in October 2014 by Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd, an additional Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out in June 2014 by Leigh Ecology Ltd on behalf of Seabridge Developments (available publicly as part of a submitted planning application). In combination, these two studies give an insight into the potential importance of this site and the information below is gleaned from both of these studies. A number of flora species present on the site are classed as 'scoring' species within the Site of Biological Interest (SBI) Guideline checklists for: - Grasslands (Anthoxanthum odoratum, Dactylorhiza fuchsia, Deschampsia cespitosa, Juncus species, Lathyrus pratensis, Plantago lanceolata, Ranunculus acris) -Woodlands (Hyacinthoides non-scripta, Myosotis sylvatica) -Wet woodlands (Cornus sanguinea, Iris pseudacorus) These species indicate that the site has clearly not been subject to intensive management, and displays some semi-natural characteristics. It is the number and abundance of indicator species that determines a site's value, and these do not need to be rare or legally protected, although any such plants would add to the value. There are	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							actually protected plants on the site, despite attempts to remove them in December 2015. The site has potential to be designated a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the Species Rich Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area, where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. 2.3. SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat survey October 2014 The Evaluation (Section 5) of the Phase 1 Habitat survey undertaken for the SMDC Local Plan review in October 2014 (Site FID 122) concluded the site is: -Classed as a woodland / scrub habitat mosaic (Broadleaved woodland, dense and scattered shrub, semi-improved grassland, tall ruderal vegetation). -“ Very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site .” “ The importance of this site is notable as it contains a range of habitat structures of different heights .” -“ The variation in vegetation structure throughout the site has good potential to support a fairly complex and diverse ecology which is accentuated by the sites good connectivity .” -“ The site is attributed district ecological importance .” The report concluded (Conclusion section 7): “ The site has potential for protected species to be present due to the mosaic of habitats and habitat structure present, especially as the site is well connected to the wider countryside. Therefore the site is not recommended for potential development as the site is deemed to have district ecological importance ”. 2.4. Developer Phase 1 Habitat survey June 2014 (Leigh Ecology Ltd) The additional Phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken in June 2014 for the developer by Leigh Ecology Ltd. This survey was in more depth and recorded the following: -“ Areas of key ecological interest within the development site include the marshy area, which contains species indicative of habitats, which are both UK BAP and Staffordshire BAP priority habitats .” (Executive summary pg.5) -“ This area contained yellow flag iris <i>Iris pseudacorus</i>, and sedge species and two orchid species, common spotted orchid <i>Dactylorhiza fuchsia</i> and southern marsh orchid <i>Dactylorhiza praetermissa</i> .” (pg.11) A photograph of the Southern Marsh Orchid in flower on site was included within this report, when the report was submitted to the council. -“ The site boundary to the western boundary consist of hawthorn hedge. Hedgerows are a UK BAP and SBAP priority habitat .”	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							(pg.14) – “ The site provided suitable nesting and foraging habitat (eg. Scrub area and shrubby broadleaved trees) for a range of bird species, including UK BAP species such as DunnockPrunellamodularis (hedge accentor) and starling Sturnus vulgaris, which together with another six species were recorded during the survey ” (pg.16) A list of birds observed during the survey is included in the report. Of particular concern are: - Dunnock (hedge accentor) – this bird is a UKBAP Priority species, with 100% of the European population occurring in the UK. The species is in decline and is Amber on the list of the Birds of Conservation Concern. -Starling (Sturnus vulgaris) – this bird is a UKBAP Priority species with a 78% decline in their population over 25 years. The species is in decline and is Red on the list of the Birds of Conservation Concern. -Willow Warbler (Phylloscopustrochilus) – The species is in decline and is Amber on the list of the Birds of Conservation Concern. 2.5. Local observations -Hedgerows - The eastern boundary contains at least 3 trees which could be classed as veteran trees. These are part of an ancient hedgerow which can clearly be seen running along the eastern boundary of the site. Two of these Ash trees are recorded as having potential bat roosts (SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 habitat survey). -Orchids - The presence of an orchid meadow is of particular concern. Orchids are themselves a key plant that indicates a species rich meadow. The presence of the Southern Marsh Orchid is of particular interest as it is listed in the Hopkins 1985 checklist as ‘Uncommon’ for Staffordshire and could trigger the classification as a ‘Site of Biological Importance’ due to its’ presence. -Bluebells - The site supports populations of native English bluebells Hyacinthoides non-scripta. It is an important indicator species for ancient woodland – in this case it could indicate the presence of ancient hedgerow on both the east and west margins of the site. It is found both within the development site itself and along the hedgerow margins. - Badgers - The Phase 1 Habitat report states that whilst Badger sets were located during the survey, no current Badger activity was observed. Local residents know that Badgers are present on the site, and they know that there is a badger set within the boundaries of site at the end of Essex Drive and York Close. Badgers from site BD062 have been frequent visitors to the gardens of homes in Essex Drive. -Bats - Presently, the gardens at the bottom of Essex Drive frequently have bats flying around at dusk each evening and there is a presence of bats within the trees on the development site, regardless of whether the trees are deemed suitable or not for bats per the report. A bat survey must be undertaken, as recommended in the Phase 1 Habitat report. The report also acknowledges that the trees and scrub areas are likely to provide abundant invertebrates, thus	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							providing foraging opportunities for bats. 2.6. Conclusion The SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 states: “ Staffordshire Moorlands contains a wide range of existing and potential green infrastructure assets, which can benefit from a strategic approach to ensure adequate protection is given to key features, to identify areas where new linkages and assets need to be created and to guide and manage development which may impact on such areas. The Core Strategy recognises the cross cutting function that green infrastructure has, and the benefits of integrating green infrastructure with social and economic priorities, which will help contribute to the development of sustainable communities .” Site BD062 links two vital wildlife corridors which travel through the Biddulph Valley and can be classed as a ‘potential green infrastructure asset’. In addition to this, the site contains species indicative of habitats, which are both UK BAP and Staffordshire BAP priority habitats. It has the potential to deliver a number of outcomes of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy, including the identification of sites suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. As such the evidence base suggests, and in fact actually states, that it should not be developed. 3. Greenbelt and Flood risk Should housing be constructed on the site, the infill of this existing Green Belt land would serve to connect the area of Gillow Heath with the Portland Drive estate and the main road, resulting in one continuous block of housing across the Biddulph valley. Site BD062 represents a clear break between the former separate hamlet/village Gillow Heath and the town of Biddulph. Should sites BD062, BD068, BD083 and BD87 all to be developed, Gillow Heath will change from a semi-rural community and become engulfed in a densely populated suburb without any green spaces separating the residential areas. This would alter the fundamental nature of Gillow Heath from that of a large hamlet/small village in the early 1960’s, to instead becoming part of the continuous urban sprawl of Biddulph stretching from Knypersley to Marsh Green Road. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed: “ will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk. ” The site is in Flood Zone 2. The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the new development as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. 4. Highways and Emergency Access The Site Assessment form states: “ Been refused planning permission in past due to insufficient capacity of York Close/Essex Drive ”, however “ highways now say 40 dwellings ok ”. The draft Site Assessment form dated September 2009 states: “ Check highway standard ”, what has happened since 2009? It was clearly identified in the previous application process (circa 1991) that the access roads were unsuitable and unsafe for additional development. In the intervening period there have been no material changes to the roads or their layouts that could have caused this position to have changed. Essex Drive and York Close Essex Drive and York Close are both dangerous for current traffic because of poor visibility around the bends, especially the first bend before the junction of Essex Drive and York Close. The road is so narrow that it does not allow cars to pass in opposite directions without cars having to manoeuvre occasionally onto the kerbs at the corners. Due to the narrow width of Essex Drive and York Close, local residents are required to park on the footpaths so that cars may freely move up and down the streets. The proposed development doubles the size of the estate and consequently the number of cars, whilst the two roads are barely adequate for the existing resident’s vehicles. Mow Lane The Essex Drive and York Close estate can only be accessed from Mow Lane, which is extremely narrow and dangerous with numerous blind bends heading towards the main road. The lane is so narrow that it does not permit vehicles travelling in the opposite directions to clearly pass. Mow Lane also has either none or inadequate street lighting along its length, and no pavements or footpaths, with no room to add them at a later date. Mow Lane is in an extremely poor state of repair and the visibility at the junction with the A527 is very poor, being obstructed by both Halls Road and the Biddulph Arms. Over the years there have been a number of serious accidents at this junction. A number of serious car accidents have also occurred on Mow lane in recent years and the safety of the lane has been raised at numerous Gillow Heath Residents Association meetings with no action taken. The reason for the lack of action is that there is physically no space to improve the width of the lane or the layout of the junctions. Heavy vehicles cannot use Mow Lane and any increase in traffic would be very hazardous. The lane is extremely hazardous for pedestrians and especially for children walking to Woodhouse Middle	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							School. Local residents generally do not walk along Mow Lane and undertake even short local journeys in their car rather than walk on the lane. Adding more housing to the areas would only result in more traffic and consequentially greater safety risks. Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. 4.1. Road standards Residents are so concerned with development taking place on roads that are already unsuitable, they have measured the roads and compared their measurement to the SHCC Highways standards. The feeder road (Essex Drive) is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – 7.5m and 7.8m sequentially (Standard = 10m) The feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) are both below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m and 4.7m respectively (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Mow Lane) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.25m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Essex Drive off Mow Lane is restricted from both directions by bridges with a maximum width of 5.15m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Mow Lane with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) – measured at 23m. The junction spacing and convergence at Congleton Road are far below highways design guidelines. (Standard = 40m opposite and 80m adjacent.) (Mow Lane and Halls Road are 0m adjacent and Smithy Lane opposite is 18m). Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “ Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development .” 5. Unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way The local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built in 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. Three well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land, there are also a number of further public footpaths which cross the site. This includes a path that runs from the end of Essex Drive and joins the National Cycle way, this path has been in use for over 30 years, and should now be adopted as a Public Right of Way. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space, protecting the	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. 6. Appropriate use of the Community Infrastructure Levy Site BD062 will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town.	
PO4947	Mr K Collier				BD062	Object	(Summary) The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph. This cant cope now with the current capacity. The SMDC states local plan phase 1 concludes the site recommended for housing. The site currently protected as a Green Belt and considered suitable for release under exceptional circumstances. The minimum standard for the SCC highways design guide policy. The local community have had an unfettered access to this site since 1971; it should be designated as visual open space. The few houses created will not add any measurable contribution to the community infrastructure. This sites should not be considered for housing because of the points raised above. There are more suitable sites around.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space. • See response to PO4963 regarding community access. • See response to PO377 regarding community contribution.
PO4949	Mrs A Jones				BD062	Object	The site by the water sewage works at Essex Drive should not be left as it is with no houses on it.	Comment noted.
PO4952	Mrs J Brennan				BD062	Object	We have lived here at Essex Drive for 38 + years and we had problems for the sewage works for all this time depending on the weather and the air conditions, to the point that during warm times all the windows and the doors had to be kept closed as the smell stung our throat. Also if one wanted to sell up it could have an effect whether a prospective buyer came on a stinky day. Also the access road is very narrow as most residents park in the street and park on the turning areas, Mow Lane is also a hazard so the increase in the traffic to the site would make it 40 times worse (that is only counting 1 car per household) There is no footpath on Mow Lane for school children and no way to step off Mow Lane to avoid the traffic when confronted with. The water table is high in this site so would increase the flow of rain water to the lower areas eventually flood the low lying land.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding.
PO6263	Mr N Lunt				BD062	Object	(Summary) Building houses on this site adjacent to the sewage works cannot be considered a good strategy. Health concerns with building houses even close to the sewage work. Also existing roads Essex Drive and York Close are barely suitable for the current traffic and the distributor road, Mow Lane, is totally unsuitable as a means of accessing this site.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO966	Mr Christopher Goldstraw				BD062	Object	Do not built on site BD062. New houses should only be built where there is minimal environmental impact. Houses should not be built in such proximity works to a sewage works. Public health and proximity to sewage works The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census reported a population of 19,892). Local residents on Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding discharge. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes the Biddulph Brook. Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. "The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance." SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and the Environment Agency were forced to clear the pollution. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities, Environment Agency, and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. Development on site BD062 contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: "The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is "appropriate for its location" in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution." SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO377 regarding the Green infrastructure strategy. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							17,000 residents. The population of Biddulph as at 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of 885 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this facility. This will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the CIL. Habitats and biodiversity The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded "...the site is not recommended for potential development..." It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. "The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets." SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							findings). The site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the Species Rich Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area, where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is "...very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site." This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. Greenbelt and Flood risk The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. It's inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed..."will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk... " The site is in Flood Zone 2 The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the new development as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. Highways and Emergency Access Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. The feeder road (Essex Drive) is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – 7.5m and 7.8m sequentially (Standard = 10m) The feeder	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							roads (Essex Drive and York Close) are both below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m and 4.7m respectively (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Mow Lane) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.25m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Essex Drive off Mow Lane is restricted from both directions by bridges with a maximum width of 5.15m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Mow Lane with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) – measured at 23m. The junction spacings and convergence at Congleton Road are far below highways design guidelines. (Standard = 40m opposite and 80m adjacent.) (Mow Lane and Halls Road are 0m adjacent and Smithy Lane opposite is 18m). Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development.”	
PO987	Mr Peter Turner				BD062	Object	Relating to ALL Green Belt incursion proposals, SMDC has arbitrarily (i.e. not based on evidence of need, demand, and availability of developable land outside of the Green Belt) set local development targets based on a percentage allocation scheme. This mechanism does not recognise the intended permanence of Green Belt as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Nor does this method withstand the tests for allowing development in the Green Belt thereby not demonstrating exceptional circumstances. On this basis the inclusion of Green Belt within the Local Plan will be challenged. It is also known that SMDC has identified developable land outside the Green Belt elsewhere within Staffordshire Moorlands, which, as directed by the NPPF, must be prioritised to be developed prior to removing any land from the Green Belt. On this basis the SMDC Green Belt review will be challenged. developing Green Belt within Biddulph will add to urban sprawl, which is key motive of protection of the Green Belt within the NPPF. The detail of this submission will be shared with elected members and the media. It is noted within the NPPF Paragraph 79 - SMDC failure to recognise permanence, openness or risk of urban sprawl The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 80 - SMDC failure to protect against urban sprawl, to protect countryside against encroachment, in urban regeneration as other sites	• See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances. • See response to PO560 regarding the 20% portion of development allocated to Biddulph in the Core Strategy.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							demonstrated as developable within the borough. Green Belt serves five purposes: ● to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; ● to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; ● to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; ● to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and ● to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 81 - SMDC failing to plan positively to enhance positive use of Green Belt, retain and enhance amenity and biodiversity, also failing to improve damaged or derelict land. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. Paragraph 83 - SMDC failure to demonstrate exceptional circumstances as other sites available in the borough outside of the Green Belt. Arbitrary approach to percentage allocation will be challenged. Failure to recognise the intended permanence of Green Belt. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Paragraph 84 - SMDC to channel development within draft Local Plan to urban areas or areas outwith the Green Belt. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 87 - SMDC failure to demonstrate very special circumstances as land outside the green belt available for development elsewhere within SMDC area. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 - SMDC failure to demonstrate very special circumstances as previously outlined. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 89 - SMDC have not demonstrated or evidenced any of the requirements as detailed in this paragraph. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: • buildings for agriculture and forestry; Achieving sustainable development 21 • provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; • the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; • the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; • limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or • limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Paragraph 90 - SMDC have not demonstrated or evidenced any of the requirements as detailed in this paragraph. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are: • mineral extraction; • engineering operations; • local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location; • the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and • development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order. Inclusion of the green Belt will be challenged on all of the above NPPF Paragraphs.	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4956	Mr and Mrs D P Pass				BD062	Object	Houses built here would make experience more odour than we already get on our street and surrounding areas. This would contradict the council's core strategy plans by not refusing the scheme which would be pollution sensitive and adequate to polluting developments. The habitat survey concluded that this site is well connected to other bio diverse habitats. Green Belt Land should only be released due to exceptional circumstances. The roads for access are too narrow and have no pavements. There are 2 pinch points on Mow Lane and blind corners. The local community have had access to this land for over 40 years. This land should be designated to for visual open space. Planning has been refused for since the sixties so what has suddenly happened or changed to make it viable now. The old Stannards Mill on Cross Street and the Old Mill Station Road, could the used for building or conversion into housing.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding community access. • See response to PO5110 regarding use of mills.
PO4948	Mrs Alison Wickstead				BD062	Object	Building homes so near to the sewage works is positively horrible we have to put up the unpleasant smells already and we are not that near. Mow Lane is a death trap already and you have to take your life into your owns hands at the junction with Congleton Road, more traffic not to mention bulldozers etc. moving up and down the lane doesn't bear thinking about Essex Drive and York Close could not possible cope with more traffic due to the width + parked cars. The area, at the end on which you are considering building on is not worth destroying this beautiful field.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO9981 regarding visual impact.
PO4967	Mrs S Stanway				BD062	Object	It doesn't make sense to build houses any closer to the sewage works in Biddulph than there are, given the problems residents are already having to cope with i.e.: noise, odour and now raw sewage, flooding. This is probably why it wasn't built on in the 1 st place. I understand the sewage works is already working over its capacity, so these problems are only going to get worse as more houses are built wherever they are. Would it not be better to identify a suitable site for another sewage works and plan the new building's sites around this instead of numerous small development sites all over the place? Access to this plot of land of land is difficult: the main road (Mow Lane) and the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) a very narrow but there are no alternative access to this site. Due to regular on street parking and the narrow roads Emergency vehicle access could be guaranteed to the furthest part of the plot.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO4966	Mr A Malbon				BD062	Object	My main objections are: Sewage works will need to expand at some point, Narrow road access in all parts of Gillow Heath especially York Close and Essex Drive. Service impact on Mow Lane with special effect at the Biddulph Arms junction. Increased car no's (40-60) on York Close (being a cul de sac) Green Belt is slowly being eroded.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4964	Mrs A Bagnall				BD062	Object	This is a very undesirable place for properties to be built by a sewage works. The roads round these country lanes will not accommodate the extra traffic.	- See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO4961	Mrs M Brindley				BD062	Object	I moved to Essex Drive in March 2016. The 1st thing that drew me to this area was the community spirit amongst the people that live here, secondly the roads butts onto Green Belt land. As I have a dog I enjoy the fact that I can walk her safely a very short distance from my home. The week I moved into Essex Drive I was aware of the awful stench coming from what I now know, is the sewage works. This happens on a regular basis, if the wind is blowing in the wrong direction. There are quite a few children who live in Essex Drive and it is a safe place for them to play out, this is very important for their social development. The road is very narrow and is unsuitable for HGV's, apart from the destruction of the Green Belt the biodiversity of this field and removing valuable piece of flood plain, the road is totally unsuitable for heavy traffic. Another consideration is the risk of suitable schools to accommodate extra families and will put extra strain on the health services, this would be costly financially and an added stress to those workers in these services. This is a complete lack of proper town planning and there are so many Brown Field sites within this area that can be utilised and empty houses that need to be looked into if the housing situation is so concerning at the moment. Proper planning with infrastructure taken into account is imperative before randomly building houses for profit. Will these houses be affordable or suitable for pensioners?	- See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. - See response to PO329 regarding flooding. - See response to PO4936 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO5110 regarding use of brownfield sites. - Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken into account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. - Affordable housing and housing suitable for older people will be provided as well as family housing.
PO4954	Mr D Bradbury				BD062	Object	We object to anymore housing in Gillow heath and the surrounding areas.	Comment noted.
PO4953	Mr R Hindmarsh				BD062	Object	As a resident of Mow Lane for 5 years I have seen several instances where the drainage system has not coped with the current demand. This has resulted pollution into the brook and sanitary items ending up in my neighbours gardens and the rear of their houses. Further stain on this already over worked system can only result in further issues for existing residents, in the Gillow Heath area. I also have major concerns on the added pressure and increased numbers of children at risk within the Biddulph Schooling System. The primary schools are already seeing an increase in the class sizes, and having fewer middle schools means that the increase will see even greater impact on the children in this age group.	- See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO4936 regarding infrastructure.
PO4955	Mr J Shelly				BD062	Object	Gillow Heath, Essex Drive, York Close has insufficient roads, to take more traffic. The sewerage system won't take any more. Mow Lane always floods in heavy rain and sewerage comes up from the man hole covers. I am sure there are more suitable sites around Biddulph??	- See response to PO4963 regarding highways. - See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. - See response to PO329 regarding flooding.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4960	Mrs M Elmhurst				BD062	Object	The Sewage Works of Biddulph are next to this site. We already have quite a lot of unpleasant odours coming from this site throughout the year. There have also been some leakages into people's gardens and the brook at the bottom of the field. It would make matters far worse if more houses were built next to the sewage works. In addition, who would want to buy/rent a house next to a malodorous and potentially an unhealthy site? Site BD062 acts as some sort of floodplain. It helps to slow down the water which comes down the hill and from the track and it goes more slowly into the brook. I can remember several times when there was flooding further and downstream (even onto the man road). If there are houses and roads and drives on this field, the water will rush off it will cause further floods downstream more easily. Mow Lane is a very busy and dangerous road. It does not have any footpaths at all except for a short stretch near Wedgewood Lane. So it is very dangerous for pedestrians and especially school children walking to and from Woodhouse Middle School (there are two choices of road are Halls Road and Marsh Middle School which also have no footpaths). Older people parents with pushchairs. In fact all people expose themselves to considerable danger each time they walk on these roads. More dwellings, and therefore, more people would make this worse. The only exit into Mow Lane would be that leading to York Close and Essex Drive. Lorries, fire engines, ambulances, already find it hard to drive down these narrow roads and turnings not to mention in case of an emergency - at night for example, when many cars are already parked on the existing roads and pavements. Also there are lots of plants, birds, animals and insects to be found on this site, their habitat would be destroyed. We have noticed more buzzards, sparrow hawks and kestrels over recent years. I cannot understand who would benefit from this field being used for building on. The community, the local environment the habitat's, the road system, the support services would be put under much greater pressure, which I think is unacceptable. For these reasons, I do not agree with the redesignation of the site.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology.
PO4959	Mr K Allen				BD062	Object	The roads are too narrow, the sewage works are all over capacity, and in Marsh Green Road there is a pumping station already put there for the houses that are already built. All these new houses will take the country side away and turn it into a town. There is not enough police for the population now; the schools are over populated now. It took over 40 years to get the bypass.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO4936 regarding infrastructure.
PO4957	Mr E Hilditch				BD062	Object	The site BD062 is too close to the sewage works which is over capacity at the moment. And will cause more flooding of sewage in the area.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4935	Mrs J Moxon				BD062	Object	The roads are not suitable for the amount of houses. It has always been Green Belt and the children can play safely, the sewage field is marsh, Akemore Lane is not suitable to carry traffic for 300 houses. The wildlife is going to be decimated, wildlife is very important for the environment.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology.
PO4937	Mr A Copeland				BD062	Object	Too much wildlife at stake here many birds nest on the land at the end of York Close + the sewage works are already over loaded.	• See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works.
PO4938	Mrs I Latta				BD062	Object	This site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph, which is already working above its desired capacity of 17000 people. We already experience unacceptable levels of noise and odours and raw sewage flooding the system during heavy rain. The local residents of Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes, such as noise odour, raw sewage and flooding, when the system back fills and pollutes Biddulph Brook and household drains. Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts the SMDC LDF core strategy where the council had already states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. Neither the distributor roads (Mow Lane) no feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highway's Design guide policy. The roads bend radii are too small. There are 2 pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane very dangerous roads with no footpath on either side in parts. There is no scope for the required developments.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO4939	Mr D Nixon				BD062	Object	I think that more development in York Close and Essex Drive would put far too much strain on such small roads cannot accommodate a further 40 properties, which could go on 2 cars per household in total 80 cars./vehicles, plus the impact on the type of nature in this part of Gillow Heath which my family enjoy so much plus the risk of flooding and a large impact on the sewage works which is already under so much strain as we can sometimes smell and my son has been flooded twice since living here on Essex Drive the water came up into his back garden so no more houses in this area pleas.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4941 PO4940	Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt				BD062	Object	Site no BD062 should not be reclassified as potential building land, and therefore taken out of the Green Belt. The sewage works is very close (in fact next to this site) and very often leaks awful odours. I do not think it will be able to cope with the extra houses + people. I believe it's already working to capacity to cope. The land should be allowed to stay as a wet meadow to do its natural job, reduce flooding by slowing down the surface run off. Mow Lane is a very narrow lane and dangerous. There are no footpaths (only a short peace of entrance to Essex Drive) for pedestrians and young children use Halls Road to get to the school. The entrance to Mow Lane and Halls Road is a terrible junction. Essex Drive and York Close would be the only means off getting to site BD062. It is a narrow road and work lorries ambulances, fire engines and all other emergency vehicles would have problems. Also parked cars on the estate. The site is home to a lot of birds, insects, animals and plants. Sparrow Hawkes fly overhead frequently, it would be a shame to lose all of this. Who would want to live right next to a sewage works? Close than I am, when we brought our house in Long Valley Road, we did not know there was a sewage works until the smell reached us. Still we get very nasty smells, more houses and people would add to that. We were told years ago that this land would never be built on because it was close to a sewage works. There has been flooding further down the field and downstream. Therefore: I don't agree with the plans to build 40 houses in site no: BD062. I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space.
PO4942	Mr I Frisby				BD062	Object	Mow Lane dangerous for 80 more cars that is if site BD062 is granted. Essex Drive and York Close is a narrow road to accept all this traffic in this modern work people will have 2 cars per household and with 400 plots you can imagine the chaos this would cause.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO4943	Mr R Blood				BD062	Object	The proposed site adoptions a sewage works on occasion's raw sewage pollutes the Biddulph Brook, I am personally aware of the strong smells from the works at times, the main road onto this site (Mow Lane) is dangerous (no foot paths – narrow bridge's – narrow roads). Local people have had access to the site for some time. The land is currently in the Green Belt and I understand the land has been recommended for potential by survey by SMDC.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding local access to site. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt and PO377 regarding exceptional circumstances.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4944	Mr D Cantrill				BD062	Object	Poor vehicle access. Increased traffic through York Close, making it dangerous for local residents and children. The ground is like a bog and would be very expensive to develop for building. Detrimental to the local wildlife. The land is used by locals for dog walks, and wildlife watching. There is a constant smell from the water treatment works. This development will destroy the view for people using the Biddulph Valley Way for leisure purposes. It will devalue property along Valley Road by destroying the view. All the access roads are just not up to the increased volume of traffic irrespective of the construction traffic.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO329 regarding flooding. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4963 regarding local access to site. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • Property values are not considered material in planning law.
PO4945	Mrs J Frisby				BD062	Object	(Summary) Essex Close and York Cloe are too narrow – already congested with on road parking due to narrow drives of the semi-detached properties, many of which are two car families. Mow Lane is already a busy road (narrow) and used by pedestrians – it needs no further traffic! Sewage works already working over capacity. The land in question has potential to be a species rich farmland site. It is currently protected by Green Belt. The site will deliver too few homes to add to any measurable contribution to the community infrastructure levy (CIL) it will not bring any direct benefit to Gillow Heath community.	• See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO4963 regarding ecology. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO377 regarding community contribution.
PO4946	Mrs J Collier				BD062	Object	The site shares a boundary with the old sewage works in Biddulph. This is already over capacity. The SMDC local plan phase 1 concludes the site recommended for housing. The site currently protected as a Green Belt and considered suitable for release under exceptional circumstances Neither of the feeder roads meets the minimum standard for the SCC highways design guide policy. The local community have had an unfettered access to this site since 1971; it should be designated as visual open space. The few houses created will not add to any measurable contribution to the community infrastructure. There are other places offering better infrastructure and not currently in the Green Belt that could be used. Leaving to this area free to remain as it has been for over 40 years. It is an important area for the council residents.	• See response to PO4963 regarding the Water Treatment Works. • See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways. • See response to PO4963 regarding community access. • See response to PO4963 regarding Visual Open Space. • See response to PO377 regarding community contribution. • See response to PO4936 regarding Infrastructure.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5627 PO5594 PO5725 PO5632 PO6039 PO5686 PO6184 PO6172 PO6982 PO5516 PO5411 PO5461 PO6892 PO6872 PO6857 PO6841 PO6833 PO6073 PO6058 PO6109 PO6093 PO6125 PO6145 PO5709 PO5748 PO5876 PO5869 PO6938 PO6623 PO7091 PO7321 PO7149 PO6840 PO6338 PO6779 PO7055 PO7033 PO7023 PO6813 PO5574 PO5555	Mrs B Ratcliffe Mr Lewis Williams Mrs Eileen Smith M Mitchell Mr Reg Grimwood Mr Jason Eardley Mrs Alison Wickstead Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr R Lawton Mr N Moxon Mrs L Cook Mrs J Moxon Mr M Mason Mr G Mason Mr A Copeland Mrs I Latta Mr D Nixon Mr I Frisby Mr R Blood Mrs J Frisby Mr D Cantrill Mrs J Collier Mr K Collier Mrs D Whalley Mr J Hammond Mr R Hodson Mrs L Hodson Mr and Mrs C.B. Dodds Mr Ronald Bailey Mrs Emma Booth Ms Emma Eardley Mr P Burns Mr D Nixon Mr N Lunt Mrs A Jones Mr C Kisicki Mr and Mrs B Carter Mrs Patricia M Lunt Mr D Wickstead Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw				BD062	Object	I object	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5609	Mr A Barbeard							
PO6023	Mr T Barker							
PO6971	Mrs M Elmhurst							
PO6946	Mr K Allen							
PO7003	Mrs D Stuttard							
PO7090	Miss E Booth							
PO6367	Mrs K Chaddock							
PO5659	Mr K Davies							
PO5001	Mr R Milner							
PO5535	Mrs M Moffatt							
PO5679	Mrs M Brindley							
PO4893	Mrs K Hallam							
PO6792	Mr M Owen							
PO6913	Mrs J Brennan							
PO6683	Mrs D Cook							
PO8138	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8174	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8083	Mr K Davies							
PO8044	Mr B Hyde							
PO8004	Mr N Goode							
PO8024	Mr K Parry							
PO7962	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7982	Mrs A Brown							
PO7278	Mrs C Dale							
PO7208	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7157	Mrs G Hall							
PO7176	Mr A Nixon							
PO7805	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg							
PO7195	Mr M Seddon							
PO7816	Mrs E Shufflebotham							
PO7825	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7846	Mr H Whalley							
PO7110	Mrs A Cunliffe							
PO7341	Mr E Hilditch							
PO7102	Mr S Booth							
PO7476	Mrs L Carter							
PO7243	Mr A Weston							
PO7549	Mrs G Weston							
PO7129	Mr A Atkinson							
PO8720	mr Stephen Willott							
PO8740	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst							
PO8675	Mrs Joan Draisey							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8760	Mrs C Johnson							
PO7882	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7902	Mr J Swindell							
PO8584	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8626	Mr R Booth							
PO8604	Mrs M Booth							
PO8646	Mrs S Stanway							
PO8650	Mr B Stanway							
PO8654	Mr A Malbon							
PO8696	Mr R Willott							
PO8716	Mrs A Bagnall							
PO8761	Mr J Whitehurst							
PO8779	Mr S Holdcroft							
PO8798	Mrs S Walters							
PO8213	Mrs P kelly							
PO8232	Mr P kelly							
PO7708	Mr D Bradbury							
PO7722	Mrs E Griffiths							
PO7767	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8896	Mrs P Hindmarsh							
PO7684	Mr J Shelly							
PO8339	Mr N Mosson							
PO8279	Mr R Cook							
PO8525	Mr D Neal							
PO8062	Mrs V Jackson							
PO6792	Mr M Owen							
PO6913	Mrs J Brennan							
PO6683	Mrs D Cook							
PO8138	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8174	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8083	Mr K Davies							
PO8044	Mr B Hyde							
PO8004	Mr N Goode							
PO8024	Mr K Parry							
PO7962	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7982	Mrs A Brown							
PO7278	Mrs C Dale							
PO7208	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7157	Mrs G Hall							
PO7176	Mr A Nixon							
PO7805	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg							
PO7195	Mr M Seddon							
PO7816	Mrs E Shufflebotham							
PO7825	Miss L Siddorn							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7846 PO7110 PO7341 PO7102 PO7476 PO7243 PO7549 PO7129 PO8720 PO8740 PO8675 PO8760 PO7882 PO7902 PO8584 PO8626 PO8604 PO8646 PO8650 PO8654 PO8696 PO8716 PO8761 PO8779 PO8798 PO8194 PO8213 PO8232 PO7708 PO7722 PO7767 PO8896 PO7684 PO8339 PO8279 PO8525 PO8062	Mr H Whalley Mrs A Cunliffe Mr E Hilditch Mr S Booth Mrs L Carter Mr A Weston Mrs G Weston Mr A Atkinson mr Stephen Willott Mrs Maureen Whitehurst Mrs Joan Draisey Mrs C Johnson Mrs S Sharrock Mr J Swindell Mrs R Knapper Mr R Booth Mrs M Booth Mrs S Stanway Mr B Stanway Mr A Malbon Mr R Willott Mrs A Bagnall Mr J Whitehurst Mr S Holdcroft Mrs S Walters Mr D Smith Mrs P kelly Mr P kelly Mr D Bradbury Mrs E Griffiths Mr R Hindmarsh Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr J Shelly Mr N Mosson Mr R Cook Mr D Neal Mrs V Jackson							
PO5144	Ms Karen Harding				BD062	Support	If Biddulph needs to be developed it should be from the town centre out to the west. The bypass would also serve this area well	Comment noted.
PO5178	Mr J. Denton				BD062	Support	We support development to the west of the Biddulph Town.	Comment noted.
PO5230	Mrs I E Sefton				BD062	Support	see previous quotes	Comment noted.
PO5337	Mr D Heath				BD062	Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options give the opportunity to achieve a better balance of the	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							town.	
PO5343	Mr D Heath				BD062	Support	The west side of the bypass lends to the better development to support the town.	Comment noted.
PO5260	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				BD062	Support	Thank you for listening to the residents and taking the off Thames Drive and Pennine Way (Most encouraging). Congleton Road from Mow Cop and looking across the Valley it seems vital to retain that green	Comment noted.
PO5002	Mr R Milner				BD062	Support	i have objections to this site remaining in the green belt - No	Comment noted.
PO5023	Mr F Moorhouse				BD062	Object	Yes i think this should be supported and left in the green belt and not taken out for developments.	Comment noted.
PO5032	Mr G Boulton				BD062	Object	Site should remain included into the green belt within Biddulph and not taken out for development.	Comment noted.
PO5221	Mr I Seabridge				BD062	Object	Essential to maintain character of the area with a definitive open area space – 'land boundary'. Existing road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate additional demand. Highways linkages and access road/egress poor. Any junction improvement at the Biddulph Road/Woodhouse Road priority junction will have an unfavourable impact on the character of the area.	• See response to PO5110 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO4963 regarding highways.
PO5303	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson				BD062	Support	All these comments are sensible and constructive, and we agree with them completely.	Comment noted.
PO5236	Mrs P G Webb				BD062	Object	Many on the Uplands Mill development have not been sold.	• Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO5240	Mrs P G Webb				BD062	Support	The town centre developments needed many more shops would be very welcomed.	Comment noted.
PO5186	Mrs A Denton				BD062	Support	We support development to the west of the Biddulph Town.	Comment noted.
PO5265	Mrs A Bridgette				BD062	Support	The bypass offers better development sites: It was designed that way. There would be better balances to the town. It is better to develop the town centre, making it more balanced Building here to the west is closer to the proposed site Chatterley Whitfield, gives the opportunity to the health centre and the town amenities.	Comment noted.
PO5278	Mrs S Purcell				BD062	Support	Agree with all the comments.	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5316 PO5325 PO5051 PO728 PO792 PO5293 PO7529 PO6463 PO9854 PO8196 PO5789 PO5169 PO5212 PO5203 PO5769 PO5382 PO5398 PO5508 PO5492 PO5333 PO5329	Mr D Lovatt Mrs T. Cooper Ms Philippa Swindells Mr Philip Beech Mrs Jayne Beech Mr S Findlow Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs Mr K Rowland Mr Gayle Mr D Smith Mr Stephen Clowes Mr S Sneyd Mrs L McQuade Miss F McQuade Mr E Pearl Mrs S Harper Mr G Harper Mrs C Drew Mr M Cook Mr G Morris Mrs R Bellwood				BD062	Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5688	Mr Jason Eardley				BD062	Object	I object	Comment noted.
PO5874	Mrs L Hodson				BD062	Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO463	Mr Alan Nixon				BD063A		I do not believe that the housing plan is supported by housing demand or need and therefore development of green belt on this or any other extension of the boundary in Biddulph can be justified. The site at BD063A is wholly unsuitable for development with inadequate infrastructure available to the site and the constraints of the adjacent bridge, Knypersley First School and traffic lights already limiting vehicular movement to/from the site. Increasing the number of cars in the immediate vicinity will undoubtedly cause problems for local residents.	- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. - The 20% figure – Biddulph's share of the District housing requirement - is set out in the Council's Core Strategy, a planning document which has been through consultation and an examination by an independent inspector. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. - The Highway Authority have not raised any issues to suggest that this site could not be developed. Further work has been undertaken by the owner's agent to demonstrate that the site can be suitably accessed in accordance with highway standards.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO27	Mr Wayne Tracey				BD063A	Object	Firstly why is this plot back in the Core strategy, it was removed some years ago due to objections and a personal visit by Sybil Ralphs. Also the named Councillor has stated the below in an interview with Leek Post and Times regarding the Greenbelt use: “Leader of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Sybil Ralphs, said this week she was totally against building on green belt land. She said: “No development should be allowed on greenfields when brownfield sites are available. “If any development impacts adversely on the quality of life for people who already live in areas proposed it should not go ahead.” I put it to you that the Target of Housing required for Biddulph can be fulfilled using up the old Brownfield sites in the area. Taking the easy option of Greenbelt sites is morally wrong and constitutes the Guidelines set out By the Government. I would like to add some information from the “House of Commons library” with reference to Green Belt: “Government policy on protection for the green belt is set out in chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states that that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as “inappropriate” for the green belt” Purpose of green belt land According to the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the green belt serves five purposes: • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.1 The CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England), describes green belts as a buffer between towns, and town and countryside whereby within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation encouraged. Also using the NPFF Document I would like you to note in section 9. It states the Green Belt should only be used in “Exceptional Circumstances” see below for the exert The NPPF also states that new green belts should only be established in “exceptional circumstances”: The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. It also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as “inappropriate” for the green belt, although there are exceptions: 89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: • buildings for agriculture and forestry; • provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; 3 Department for Communities and Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 Number 00934, 30	• A larger area was considered as a broad area for development as part of the Core Strategy but not included in the final version of the plan. The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review (published in 2015) in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering a smaller variant of site BD063a for release from the Green Belt but considers that other options would be better. The capacity of the site has been reduced from 120 to 40 to reflect the results of the Green Belt Review. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph’s housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD063a. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							June 2015 6 • the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; • the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; • limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or • limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. With reference to the above guidelines, I don't feel that any "exceptional Circumstances" have been met. I believe there are lots of other plots listed that would be a lot more suitable and have no impact on the surrounding areas, infrastructure, landscape etc Since receiving the information from yourselves, I took the liberty to speak to a Local Head Mistress at a school in Biddulph, she believes that before more houses are constructed a school should be built to cope with the current demand, and certainly a better road network, especially the ones around the site(s) mentioned above. Schools in biddulph are currently full and will be for the next 4-5 years, this is based on figures available to the school network, using births etc. I have some images of the roads around proposed site BD063a, these are images gathered by myself and a neighbour over the past 10 years, it clearly shows that the road network cannot cope with the current residents. The congestion at the local surrounding Schools during hour leaving and arrival times is total mayhem, and the rush hour times are just as bad, the images will be posted with this document to support my case. I strongly object to the proposal to any housing development on Green Belt sites in the country and especially the ones in question.	See response to PO463 regarding highways.
PO251	Mr Thomas Faughnan				BD063A	Object	This is green belt land and should remain so. There are over 2000 houses currently for sale in Biddulph therefore why do we need to add another 885. In the recent green belt review of November 2015 the area covered by BD063A makes a 'significant contribution to maintain separation, prevent encroachment and preserve setting, plus a contribution to check sprawl'. This is the only area designated as significant in this review to still appear on the preferred options map, and it is also not included in Appendix C i.e. Sites with potential for release without damaging Green Belt purposes.	- Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. - See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - Comments noted.
PO209	Mr Stephen Platt				BD063A	Object	i object to any ammendments on the greenbelt	Comments noted.
PO66	Mrs Clare Tracey				BD063A	Object	Firstly "Greenbelt Land is Protected" under many laws in this country, and should only be used as a last resorts, as there are many Brownfield sites available in the district and also Greenfield sites, I can see no lawful reason to use any of the proposed Greenbelt sites	- See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO27 regarding use of brownfield sites including mills and land at Victoria Colliery and

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							in the core strategy, particularly this one. Can the council provide any strategy or information showing the plans to use up current Brownfield sites in Biddulph before we start destroying the landscape. I personally think we are taking the easy option, I would like to see more effort from the council in way of producing residents information about Brownfield Sites use, similar to the efforts displayed with the altering of Brownfield Sites. A huge Review was commissioned and compiled by “Amec Foster Wheeler” Can we not commission a review into using up Brownfield Sites, and also perhaps another review in the houses built on the Uplands Mill site that are currently not selling? After moving into our new property 4 months ago we love the views and use the public right of way on a regular basis, this particular “public right of way” runs through BD063A. The proposed site is Filled with Nature/Wildlife and picturesque views, building 40 Houses on this Famers Field is morally wrong, this is why the site is GreenBelt to start with, to Prevent “Urban Sprawl”. Doing this is would destroy the landscape and the village, de value the neighbourhood. I would also like to point out that since moving into the property it is quite apparent that the road network around BD063a simply cannot cope with current traffic and volume, 1 car can pass over the small bridge on Newpool road, this is packed with Traffic during School Runs and Rush hour. Cars are left abandoned as the roads are too narrow for parking. Emergency Services even struggle when trying to cross the bridge, buses and Lorries are commonly stuck and reversing to allow one to pass. Also, the local schools are full, I have a 6 Year old in Knypersley First School and I have a relative who works in the school, the school is full and is planned to be full for 4-5 years. This is the same for most schools in Biddulph. Where are the influx of children that would come with all of these homes get educated? Perhaps the council should first improve the Infrastructure and possibly build another school to cope, before building 100’s of houses in an area already over populated and with a road network bursting with traffic. I have now noticed that in new plans that a first school is now proposed. In The winter of 2014 we purchased our home, paid a lot of money for it, and stretched ourselves to have our forever home, with unhindered views surrounded by “PROTECTED” Greenbelt, if this proposal happened the devaluation of about 30 Properties will happen, not to mention the congestion around the area. Could the council provide me a list of Protected Greenbelt plots that could possibly remain greenbelt in the Future? What is the point in having the law in place if in years to come you will simply change the status, it was given the greenbelt status for a very good and genuine reason. Suitable sites would be BD071 + BD071A + BD106 + BD156, these are better suited as the road can cope with volume of traffic as it lines the Bypass. I strongly object to the proposal to any housing development on Green Belt sites.	Childerplay. • The Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment reviews available sites in Biddulph including brownfield sites. • See response to PO251 regarding empty properties. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage. • The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of ‘Preferred’ allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: This site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for ‘local wildlife site’ (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects ‘Preferred’ sites. • The Council’s Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) concludes that the land is of low landscape sensitivity. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO463 regarding highways. • The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward. • BD071 + BD071A + BD106 + BD156 are already included in the Draft Local Plan and Green Belt land is needed over and above these sites to meet Biddulph’s housing requirements.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO214	Mrs Christine Faughnan				BD063A	Object	The National Planning Policy Framework states that green belt will not be built on unless there are exceptional circumstances - there are no exceptional circumstances on this land. The access point will be between a bend and the brow of a hill. There will be a loss of privacy and light. The green belt review states that there are better areas to use than BD063a, to the west of Biddulph. Newpool Road is already a busy road with traffic jams at school times by the bridge. Land off Childerplay road would be more suitable for housing.	- See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO463 regarding highways. - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. - See response to PO27 regarding use of brownfield sites including mills and land at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay.
PO283	Mrs Sandra Walley				BD063A	Object	The infrastructure of Newpool Road, the actual road, the bridge, the access to the proposed site all are not suitable. The local school is full. There are already numerous congestion issues on Newpool Road, and these will be severely increased with the proposed 40 properties and all the extra traffic that would bring. George Osbourne MP stated in the House of Commons 25th May 2016 "We will not be using Green Belt to build houses when other better options are available". There are Brown Field sites within the Biddulph Boundaries, some of these are far more suitable, they already have adequate infrastructure in place. Also, I feel that there are many empty properties in Biddulph that appear to be surplus to requirements. There is no new employment in Biddulph, the new house owners will need to commute, again putting serious stress on the transport system. Has anyone noticed that the Network Rail public transport infrastructure does not run through Biddulph?	- See response to PO463 regarding highways. - See response to PO66 regarding education. - See response to PO27 regarding use of brownfield sites including mills and land at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay. - See response to PO251 regarding empty properties. - New employment areas are also proposed for Biddulph in the draft Local Plan.
PO368	Ms Deborah Johnston				BD063A	Object	Building 40 houses on greenbelt land totally contradicts what greenbelt land policy was devised for which was to control urban growth for the foreseeable future and to ensure that the land is permanently open and is an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can prevail. When we lose open greenbelt land, we lose more than just a view, a space to run or play, an easy escape from the city or valuable farmland. We lose land that has its own identity and plays its own role in England's heritage. Instead of building on it we should be using it to its best effect. Instead of an urban sprawl people would like to see more trees planted, farm animals grazing there and more food grow, by providing more local produce it will help the environment and reduce food miles. The openness of greenbelt land needs to be cherished and protected permanently not to build an urban development. Once this greenbelt land has been built on its gone forever and future generations will not have the pleasure of looking out on to the land and enjoying the lushness and wildlife that this greenbelt land provides. Stop taking the easy option and leave greenbelt land alone and start using the brownfield sites that have not even been considered.	- See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO27 regarding use of brownfield sites including mills and land at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO713	Ms Ruth Rowland				BD063A	Object	I object to the Newpool Road/Meadowside development site (BD063A) on the following grounds: Nature conservation Flood risk Infrastructure - schools Infrastructure - traffic and transport Landscape and tourism Amenity Scale of development Government policy 1.) The area is currently a haven to wildlife including protected species (owls and bats). 2.) This section of agricultural land is listed as one of the very few 'best areas' in North Staffs and Derbyshire. It should be preserved. (Agricultural lands classification map for the West Midlands): http://www.soilenvironmentservices.co.uk/agricultural-land-survey/?gclid=CjwKEAjkPS6BRD2ioKR7K245jASJAD1ZqHOTboEWqCk23nT-mOn7fQz33aildwUNHqh9PMhyvgQxoCSLnw_wcB 3.) Biddulph is deemed the 'Garden Town of Staffordshire'. The area should not be developing greenbelt land, but making the area more attractive to tourists, thereby boosting the economy. 4.) The proposed sight will increase noise pollution, air pollution, light pollution and visual pollution. 5.) Ancient trees and hedgerows could be lost or damaged. 6.) There will be a loss of privacy, and loss of light to current residents. 7.) The council have not taken into account the current guideline for increased dwellings, which is now 43% of the 6000 originally proposed. 8.) Educational, health and dental provision is at full capacity and cannot support proposed increases in population. 9.) Knypersley First School is a few hundred yards away from the proposed site and there is already traffic congestion. Parking is at a premium, with the school run becoming increasingly dangerous to pedestrians and motorists alike. 10.) Full consideration has not been given to brownfield sites within Biddulph. 11.) Part of BD063a was the site of a Victorian mine and contains disused mine shafts. 12.) Suggested suitable employment sites are totally ill founded when unoccupied retail and commercial buildings remain in Biddulph and Brown Lees Industrial Estate. 13.) The narrow farm track would not provide a safe exit for vehicles using the proposed site. Several accidents have happened at the junction of Towerhill Road and Newpool Road. This development would exacerbate the problem. The proposed 120 dwellings could generate 150 to 200+ extra cars. 14.) Residential access to BD063A would be shared with Newpool Farm. Agricultural traffic, including cattle and hay-bearing trucks and tractors would make this unsuitable and further congested.	- See response to PO66 regarding ecology. - The Environment Agency has stated that the area is not affected by flooding. Any drainage issues on the land could be resolved through new development. - See response to PO463 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO463 regarding highways. - See response to PO66 regarding landscape impact. - See response to PO463 regarding housing need. - If the district council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. - The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 3 which means that it is good to moderate. It is up to the Council to balance all the planning issues in determining whether to select a site for development in the Local Plan. - If development takes place on this site any protected trees would be preserved unless there are exceptional circumstances in which case re-planting would be required. Soft landscaping would be integrated into any scheme. If the site is developed hedgerows would be retained within the scheme layout wherever possible. - See response to PO214 regarding residential amenity. - The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - See response to PO27 regarding consideration of brownfield sites. - The Council's employment assessment already takes into account empty employment units in calculating future needs for employment land in the District.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO805 PO813	Mrs Sue Ward Mr Arthur Ward				BD063A	Object	A. I wish to raise my objections to the Newpool Road/Meadowside site (BD063A). I feel that the plans presented by the Council are greatly flawed for the following reasons:- Shouldn't domiciliary increases be viewed from a Staffordshire county perspective when so many factories & Pot Banks lie derelict within the Stoke-on-Trent area and other large towns? The Council haven't produced any plans for any increase in educational, health, dental or utility provisions. All the areas are at full capacity and cannot withstand the proposed increases in population within this area. Full consideration has not been given to brownfield sites within Biddulph - the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to the town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years – many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. The suggested suitable employment sites seem totally ill founded when within this area we have unoccupied retail and commercial buildings within Biddulph, in addition to vacant land within the Brown Lees Industrial Estate. Has any consideration been given to the use of some of the Open spaces for housing and replace that Open Space from Greenbelt land? B. I totally support all the objections for the use of Greenbelt land for some of these sites. The use of BD117, BD76A and BD76 for housing would provide the majority of land for the area's housing based on point A1 above. C. Having lived on Newpool Road for over 20 years and have first-hand knowledge of the points below. My main objection is to BD063A proposal of 40 dwellings for the following geographical reasons:- 1. Currently the only access to this site is a single-farm-track with a bungalow one side of it and a house the other. Even with the removal of the thick hedge it would be a very narrow two-way road. 2. This entrance is immediately after a bend at the brow of a hill making it a very dangerous exit onto Newpool Road at any time of the day. People use Newpool Road to avoid the speed camera on Tunstall Road and the speed humps on Lyneside Road. 3. The proposed 40 new dwelling will probably generate between 60 to 110 extra vehicles using Newpool Road which is not and never has been a road for major traffic. The Lyneside Road and the Brown Lees developments had a serious effect on the current traffic problems but this development proposal ensures dangerous traffic with potential fatalities. 4. The "old railway bridge" area which lies between the school and the proposed site BD063a access is narrow & virtually impossible to negotiate around school times and rush hour especially for emergency vehicles, buses or any delivery lorry. It is not unusual to see one or other of them stuck and reversing to allow other to pass. 5. Knypersley First School is just 1/4 mile away from this	• Housing allocations are needed to ensure the District's housing requirement is met. Each District in Staffordshire has its own housing requirement. • See response to PO463 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO27 regarding consideration of brownfield sites. • See response to PO713 regarding empty employment units. • Open space needs to be accessible to local communities so developing it and replacing it outside the town in the green belt is not considered to be a satisfactory approach in planning policy. • The Council is looking to meet the future employment land needs of the District in the period to 2031 – refer to its employment land assessment for further details. • See response to PO463 regarding highways. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology. • See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Objection/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							proposed site, next to the 'traffic light controlled' crossroads with A527, Tunstall Road. Currently during rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars are on both sides of the road (and on the adjoining roads of Meadowside and Lyneside) exacerbate the situation and result in total traffic chaos. D. The site has an abundance of wildlife and picturesque views, the building proposal is immoral, the site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on - there is nothing exceptional about the Council's plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Greenbelt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population.	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO711 PO721	Mr Graham Mellor Mrs Gail Mellor				BD063A	Object	The proposal to build on greenbelt land off Newpool Road (BD063A) would have an adverse impact on the immediate area which would significantly outweigh any benefits. The current lie of the ground allows water, through natural drainage, to percolate through the soil and thus disperse via natural means. If the area were to become "hard standing" then there would be little doubt that existing properties will be seriously affected by runoff water, after rain and/or snowstorms. The land falls away considerably towards the "tin bridge" area. Properties in this vicinity would be affected as well as being greatly overlooked by any buildings on the higher ground behind them. This problem currently affects other properties higher up the land. The proposal would exacerbate the situation decreasing the ability of standing water to percolate away. Access to the proposed site would mean an increase in vehicles using Newpool Road - a well-known and much used "rat run"/shortcut to avoid the main Tunstall Road and it's, monitored, speed restrictions and hold ups. There are no monitored speed restrictions on Newpool Road, which is quite obvious to residents living in the proximity. Many near miss accidents are observed, both for pedestrians and vehicles, on a daily basis. There is a blind spot at the junction with Lyneside Road which is proceeded a few yards up the road by a bend on the brow of a hill-where the site access is proposed. An increase of at least fifty additional vehicles plus delivery and collection vehicles along with a significant increase in pedestrians will surely increase the likelihood of more mayhem, to an already busy and unmonitored roadway on a hill, on a bend and at a blind spot. Common sense must prevail and make potential accident prevention paramount. The site proposed is an area of natural beauty and greenbelt. It consists of mature hedgerows and large trees on open farmland and is home to many species of wild life. It is accessible via public footpaths and is used by hikers, ramblers and locals alike. It is an amenity that cannot be replaced. It should be preserved for future generations. It appears that it is better planning to preserve brown field sites, such as the old Victoria Colliery, Childerplay and land purchased by the owners of the car wash on the A527, all available for building, than preserve our natural heritage. I question the need to have to object to this proposal - again. It is only a few years ago that this site was deemed unsuitable for development. Will I have to spend the rest of my years wondering when the next attack is due? As an aside I received confirmation, from yourselves, that you had received my objection on the last occasion but it does not appear on your records. Is there any reason for this? I am also aware of others who have experienced the same situation.	• See response to PO713 regarding drainage. • See response to PO214 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO463 regarding highways. • See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology. • See response to PO66 regarding loss of public footpath. • See response to PO27 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road. • See response to PO27 regarding the mills. • A larger area was considered as a broad area for development as part of the Core Strategy but not included in the final version of the plan. • Regarding comments made in response to the previous consultation, the data was published in a different format which did not include the names of everyone who objected, just a list of the issues raised in their objections and Council responses. Only the statutory bodies (e.g. Environment Agency) were named in the report and not private individuals.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO694	Dr P R Rowland				BD063A	Object	The development will result in the loss of valuable greenbelt, and is directly contradictory to the designated aims of Green Belt. In particular it will lead to the sprawl of built-up areas. The loss of countryside to urban encroachment Wildlife, in particular bats, and owls live in this area. Loss of valuable hedge rows and trees (some ancient) would result in loss of habitat for this wildlife. The visual impact will be ugly, and adversely impact on the unique rural flavour of the area. Ignores the alternatives of recycling derelict or other urban land available in the area. In addition, It will cause a loss of privacy for many families. There would definitely be a loss appeal to visit, live or remain in the area. Living conditions of local people will deteriorate due to noise, pollution, light pollution, overcrowded medical and school facilities. Safety of drivers and pedestrians will be compromised, especially schoolchildren attending Knypersley First School and Park Middle School (already heavily congested on school days.) Do these schools have the capacity to receive the influx of additional children, or, the ground and resources to be expanded? Access to this site is restricted; currently a farm track with houses each side. Biddulph/Knypersley is already lacking in facilities for outdoor sport or recreation. Again in keeping with government policies, the local authority should be engaged in positive, forward thinking, long term plans, to quote Government Planning Practice Guidance "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land."	• See response to PO463 regarding highways. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology. • See response to PO713 regarding hedgerows and trees. • See response to PO214 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO463 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO463 regarding education capacity. • See response to PO463 regarding highways / access to site. • A Public Open Space Study is underway. • See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land including the mills. • See response to PO27 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road.
PO783	Mrs Anne Barnsley				BD063A	Object	I wish to object to the proposed BD063a site Newpool Road/Meadowside – this area is Green Belt land and is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing. The road infrastructure cannot currently deal with the volume of traffic using Newpool Road – this is already a busy road used by drivers avoiding the speed cameras on Tunstall Road, the speed humps on Lyneside Road and is the main route through to Mow Cop and Brown Lees. The "tin bridge" is narrow and a severe hazard and can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles ie. buses, lorries, tractors attempt to cross over. More importantly this hazard also affects the Emergency Services! During rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars on both sides of the road (and on adjoining roads – Meadowside and Lyneside Road) exacerbate the situation and result in traffic chaos. The proposed access to site BD063A is on a dangerous bend and the brow of a hill on Newpool Road; this raises major concerns regarding safe visibility for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site. The addition of 40 houses on this proposed site will cause increased traffic flow of approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within	• See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO27 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO713 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO463 regarding highways. • See response to PO463 regarding access to site. • See response to PO463 regarding education capacity. • See response to PO463 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology. • See response to PO27 regarding the mills. • See response to PO27 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road. • See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							this overburdened area. Knypersley First School (located at the junction of Tunstall Road/Newpool Road) is currently full to capacity and projected to be so for the next 4-5 years; this also applies to other schools in the area. In addition, local Doctors/Dentists have no capacity to accommodate new patients. The site has an abundance of wildlife and picturesque views, the building proposal is immoral, the site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the Council's plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population. Government policy is that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of Greenfield and certainly Green Belt sites – the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to Biddulph town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years - many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. Biddulph and the neighbouring areas are a lovely part of the Staffordshire Moorlands and as such should be protected. I am of the firm belief that a stop should be put to this proposed development and any destruction of Green Belt land. Site BD117 - Situated on the A527 on the outskirts of the town - this site has currently been identified as a "Potential Suitable Employment Site". However, in view of the fact that there are vacant units, plus scope for expansion on the Victoria Business Park, I feel that this site is more ideally suited for consideration as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site". In addition, I would also suggest that land on the left-hand side (from the A527) of Childerplay Road is also considered as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site".	
PO865	Ms Norma Gibson				BD063A	Object	I wish to object to the Development with the green belt. The NPPF states that the green belt is to be protected and requires exception circumstances to be built on. I can not think of any exceptional circumstances and as yet Staffordshire Moorlands District Council have provided none. Given that there are a number of Brownfield sites in the area I do not see how this can be justified.	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO854	Miss Keelie Mellor				BD063A	Object	I am objecting to the Green Belt amendments with reference to site BD063a. The National Planning Policy Framework states that green belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on - there are NO exceptional circumstances to build on this site. This site has an elevated incline. Properties on this site would have a dominate and detrimental effect on the landscape. Many of the properties that border this site are bungalows - this will cause a massive loss of privacy. This field is an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. It provides views of the natural landscape and if developed on, this connection with the natural environment will be lost forever. It is working agricultural land. The wildlife that lives on this site is vast. There are bats, owls, birds of prey, foxes to name but a few. Destroying their habitats is unacceptable. Your own green belt review details that there are better options for housing.	• See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO713 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO66 regarding impact on the landscape • See response to PO27 regarding the mills. • See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO463 regarding highways / access to the site. • Any drainage issues on the land could be resolved through new development. The Environment Agency has stated that the area is not affected by flooding. • See response to PO463 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO713 regarding mining legacy. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology.
PO973	Mr John Hayley				BD063A	Object	As a local resident I call on SMDC to remove area BD063a from the 2012-2031 Local Plan Preferred Option Sites. This community is opposed to Green Belt development and we believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council needs to consider the following: 1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): I. NPPF states that greenbelt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on unspoiled land to meet their current housing target. II. NPPF states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly greenbelt sites, but these plans offer up greenbelt in advance of brown field site development. III. NPPF states that merging of communities is to be prevented, yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. IV. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place, or are not time-lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare with these massive scale extensions of population. 2. Impact on highway safety and traffic: I. This section of Newpool Road (BD063A) is already affected by high volumes of traffic flow at peak times and school hours. The bridge access at the bottom of Newpool Road can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles i.e. buses & lorries attempt to cross over, this can be seen with the attached press articles & photos. The current access to site BD063A is via a single carriageway access road, which would not provide proper and safe access to a development of 40 houses the access would need to be upgraded with the formation of a proper road junction and pavement area to allow for safe access and continued traffic flow, this would potentially mean the need to restructure the garden areas to 58 and 60 Newpool Road to allow for a safe visibility splay for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site (the garden area of 58	• See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO463 regarding highways / access to the site. • See response to PO66 regarding ecology. • See response to PO713 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO66 regarding impact on the landscape • See response to PO214 regarding residential amenity

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Newpool Road goes straight out to the existing pavement area and would not allow for any room to create a safe visibility splay for cars or pedestrians). The adding of forty houses on this area will cause increased traffic flow of over approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area. 3. Conservation of the natural environment: I. The above site is host to different species of bats, owls and a huge array of wildlife that will perish as a result of the proposed development. II. Site BD063A is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing which provide the community a meaningful way to connect with the natural environment. 4. Effect on the landscape: I. The development of Site BD063A which has an elevated incline with potential two & three storey properties would have a dominate and detrimental effect on the landscape, as the majority of properties that currently boarder this site are bungalows and this will create an overpowering effect to these properties with the loss of privacy. These fields are an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. Site BD063A provides views of the natural landscape and if developed on, this connection with the natural environment will be lost forever. 5. Other comments: I. The proposed new town boundary for this site has no physical boundaries to prevent unchecked incursion into surrounding Green Belt countryside making this location vulnerable to future encroachment. There is a danger that this boundary change will lead to further encroachment and urban sprawl towards Tower Hill Road and Akesmoor Lane in years to come. This proposed boundary does not meet NPPF criteria stating that a Green Belt change must have long term permanence capable of enduring for 30-50 years. II. I would recommend that no further housing expansion within Newpool should be permitted until and unless road improvements are made to the old railway bridge at the bottom of Newpool Road.	
PO1053	Mr David Kirkham				BD063A	Object	I object strongly to the building of houses on greenfield sites when there are plenty of brown field sites available in this area. The BD063a site has many problems. The first being the entrance and exit from this site is narrow and has poor visibility on the right exit. The left exit is on the brow of a hill making exiting very difficult. Lower down Newpool Road we have a narrow bridge to negotiate which is an absolute nightmare at both school and work times of the day. There is an additional problem with parking on either side of the road at the school which adds extra pressure on the already busy junction. This is an already busy road which is used as a short cut. The entrance to this site also has a bus stop each side of the road causing another problem. So, 40 houses, possible 80 vehicles added to an existing busy road (A NIGHTMARE).	• See response to PO27 regarding the mills. • See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO463 regarding highways / access to the site.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9266	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	BD063A	Object	We would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in Biddulph and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development of the land at Newpool Farm being promoted by our client.	See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review.
PO947 PO952	Mr John Hancock Mrs Alwyn Hancock				BD063A	Object	I wish to raise my objections to the proposed BD063A site Newpool Road/Meadowside – this area is Green Belt land and is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing. The road infrastructure cannot currently deal with the volume of traffic using Newpool Road – this is already a busy road used by drivers avoiding the speed cameras on Tunstall Road, the speed humps on Lyneside Road and is the main route through to Mow Cop and Brown Lees. The “tin bridge” is narrow and a severe hazard and can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles ie. buses, lorries, tractors attempt to cross over. More importantly this hazard also affects the Emergency Services! During rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars on both sides of the road (and on adjoining roads – Meadowside and Lyneside Road) exacerbate the situation and result in traffic chaos. The proposed access to site BD063A is on a dangerous bend and the brow of a hill on Newpool Road; this raises major concerns regarding safe visibility for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site. The addition of 40 houses on this proposed site will cause increased traffic flow of approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area. The site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the Council’s plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population. Government policy is that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of Greenfield and certainly Green Belt sites – the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to Biddulph town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive	- See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO27 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. - See response to PO713 regarding loss of agricultural land. - See response to PO463 regarding highways. - See response to PO463 regarding access to site. - See response to PO27 regarding the mills. - See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land. - See response to PO463 regarding infrastructure capacity. - See response to PO854 regarding drainage. - See response to PO854 regarding flooding. - See response to PO463 regarding Education capacity. - See response to PO713 regarding mining legacy.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendm ent	Support/Ob ject/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years - many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. Biddulph and the neighbouring areas are a lovely part of the Staffordshire Moorlands and as such should be protected. A stop should be put to this proposed development and any destruction of Green Belt land.	
PO4690	Mr D Goodwin				BD063A	Object	This Is Green belt land. According to the Government guidelines, Green Belt should not be built on except in exceptional circumstances in our opinion my opinion is not an exceptional circumstance and has not fully investigated other brown field sites that are available BD063 was also in a previous plan and then withdrawn as being unsuitable. It is still unsuitable. Any extra Housing off Newpool Road will be will because even more problems with traffic trying to negotiate the old railway bridge, the school traffic trying to negotiate the school and Knypersley traffic lights.	- See response to PO27 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO27 regarding brownfield land. - See response to PO463 regarding highways.
PO9706	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				BD063A	Object	Object to adjustment of Green Belt boundary to include this site.	Comment noted.
PO5863 PO6052 PO5696 PO5669 PO5541 PO6591 PO6197 PO6432 PO6826 PO5618 PO5438 PO6032 PO6965 PO5526 PO5501 PO5484 PO5419 PO6904 PO6885 PO6866 PO6850 PO6085	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr Reg Grimwood Mr Jason Eardley Mr K Davies Mrs M Moffatt Mrs Beverley Holding Mrs Alison Wickstead Mr Paul Malkin Mr D Wickstead Mr A Barbeard Mrs K Hallam Mr T Barker Mr K Allen Mr N Moxon Mr M Cook Mrs L Cook Mrs L Cook Mr M Mason Mr G Mason Mr A Copeland Mrs I Latta Mr I Frisby				BD063A	Object	I object	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6102	Mr D Cantrill							
PO6121	Mrs J Frisby							
PO6139	Mrs J Collier							
PO6158	Mr K Collier							
PO5757	Mr J Hammond							
PO6491	Mr Gilbert Bradley							
PO7392	Mr and Mrs D P Pass							
PO7539	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs							
PO6805	Mr M Owen							
PO6471	Mr K Rowland							
PO6925	Mrs J Brennan							
PO8456	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO8495	Miss L Delves							
PO8152	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8153	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8097	Mr K Davies							
PO8056	Mr B Hyde							
PO8017	Mr N Goode							
PO8034	Mr K Parry							
PO7998	Mrs A Brown							
PO7293	Mrs C Dale							
PO7232	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7189	Mr A Nixon							
PO7170	Mrs G Hall							
PO7840	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7858	Mr H Whalley							
PO7334	Mrs E Griffiths							
PO7424	Mr J Banister							
PO8845	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8935	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer							
PO8873	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO7896	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7921	Mr J Swindell							
PO8597	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8639	Mr R Booth							
PO8788	Mr S Holdcroft							
PO8226	Mrs P Kelly							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8241 PO8972 PO8353 PO8333 PO8559 PO8578 PO7874 PO7759 PO7956	Mr P Kelly Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr N Mosson Mrs S Bennett Mr R Scales Mrs J Scales Mrs J Banister Mr R Bradbury Mr A Lehepoo							
PO793	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD063A	Support	I support the inclusion of BD063A in the proposal.	Comment noted.
PO5600	Mr Lewis Williams				BD063A	Support	i support all the above sites	Comment noted.
PO729 PO5841 PO5742 PO5819 PO5647 PO5798 PO6005 PO6398 PO7068 PO6657 PO6453 PO6568 PO6569 PO6677 PO7046 PO5584 PO5585 PO5564 PO7016 PO5470 PO6067 PO5373 PO6289 PO6638	Mr Philip Beech Mr Carl Mason Mrs Eileen Smith Mr Christopher Slater M Mitchell Mr Stephen Clowes Mrs L Price Mr C Kisicki Ms Heather Mason Mr Norman Smith Mr Jeffrey Leese Mr Jeffrey Leese Mrs J M Slater Mr and Mrs B Carter Mrs S Wilshaw Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw Mrs D Stuttard Mrs J Moxon Mr R Blood Mr S Leese Mr and Mrs I Condliffe Mr Ronald				BD063A	Support		Comments noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD063a)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Objection/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6611	Bailey Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO6346	Mr N Lunt							
PO6412	Mr P Squires							
PO6700	Mrs D Cook							
PO6245	Mrs S Goodwin							
PO8273	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO8514	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8132	Ms Barbara Griffiths							
PO8428	R Hutton							
PO7936	Mr C Kirkham							
PO8476	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO8391	Mr John James							
PO8187	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8168	Mrs Angela Turner							
PO7976	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7977	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7123	Mrs A Cunliffe							
PO7502	Mrs L Carter							
PO7263	Mr A Weston							
PO7568	Mrs G Weston							
PO8733	Mr Stephen Willott							
PO8753	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst							
PO8916	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO8668	Mr A Malbon							
PO8774	Mr J Whitehurst							
PO8207	Mr D Smith							
PO7716	Mr D Bradbury							
PO7799	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8292	Mr R Cook							
PO8539	Mr D Neal							
PO8407	Mr G Price							
PO8960	Mr C Goodwin							
PO9673	Mrs P Hancock							
PO9856	Mr Gayle							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (housing site BD067)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO535 PO593	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey				BD067	General comment	As a resident of North East Biddulph and very concerned about the previously proposed sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 along behind Pennine Way, Torville Drive, etc. I am very pleased to support the change their status to Constrained. I understand that the Green Belt Review rejected these as being too close to Biddulph Moor and if built on create urban sprawl taking the two areas much too close to each other. It is good for Biddulph that the Pennine Way, etc. sites are taken off, North East Biddulph is already too extended and saturated. Retains the Biddulph / Biddulph Moor separation and the open space between them. Stops the housing development that would have been highly visible from most of the rest of Biddulph.	Comments noted. These sites are not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO469	Mrs Jean Wrench				BD067	General comment	A balanced approach is required regarding new build so that uneven saturation does not occur.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO852	Mrs Andrea Millington				BD067	General comment	The purpose of the greenbelt is to protect developments from urban sprawl and the greatest threat to this lies at the north east of the town, there is now a major threat of Biddulph town and Biddulph Moor being amalgamated as one urban settlement and if there were to be further development up the hill to the moor there will be no clear physical distinction between the boundaries.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO82	Mr Robert Moseley				BD067	Object	No need to build on green belt land, find alternative housing solution.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016). In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance).
PO281	Mrs Judith Cottrell				BD067	Object	The Green Belt should be retained in the whole of the Biddulph area. In particular, the areas adjoining BD 067 are unsuitable for building purposes, it is an area of natural beauty and attracts a large number of birds and other wild animals, it is also subject to flooding; and, if built upon, would encroach upon the boundary between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor, thus creating urban creep.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016). In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance).
PO288	Mr Peter Benn				BD067	Object	No other comments are visible. Why?	All comments have to be moderated before they can be viewed publically. Once this has been done, they will be published at the same time.
PO440	Mrs Janice Deane				BD067	Object	Object to any changes to green belt. All we have in Biddulph is lovely countryside	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016). In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (housing site BD067)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
								Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance).
PO631	Mrs Amanda Reed				BD067	Object	Green belt areas are an attraction to Biddulph residents and wild life should be protected	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016). In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance).
PO646	Ms Alison Conybeare				BD067	Object	This applies to all the green belts: Green belt boundaries should not be changed.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016). In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance).
PO614 PO1018 PO6185 PO6583 PO7004 PO5515 PO6110 PO5969 PO5944 PO6795	Mrs Ellen Faulkner Mr Leonard Hill Mrs Alison Wickstead Mrs Beverley Holding Mrs D Stuttard Mr N Moxon Mrs J Frisby Mr M Clews Mr H Ebdon Mr M Owen				BD067	Object		Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (housing site BD067)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO303	Mr Russell Picken				BD067	Support	It is extremely important to both the communities of Biddulph and Biddulph Moor that the green belt is not extended eastwards in the northern half of the town, which would then result in urban sprawl; one of the main things that the green belt was designed to protect towns and villages from in semi-rural locations like these. (Further development here would have resulted in the town appearing similar to a foreign holiday resort, where the properties extend from the valley floor all the way up the side of the valley to the horizon.) It is therefore welcomed, with great appreciation, that the sites BD067a, BD067b, BD067c, BD110 and BD134 have been removed from preferred options of allocation of sites. If any further extension of the green belt is required, then it should occur on the western side of the town, in site BD116 and the area of site BD140, adjacent to the currently preferred sites of BD071 and BD071a, possibly extending southwards from area ADD03.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO323	Frank Cottrell				BD067	Support	Where ever we build in Biddulph green belt will be used ,all brown field sites should be used first until all these sites have been used Victoria Colliery site is a recent green field site and if building is to be done then this is a suitable site to use.	Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph would be appropriate for residential development. The larger ones (Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) could be residential allocations in the plan. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. Biddulph Town Council is currently working on a masterplan for the town centre. Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD067. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO454	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				BD067	Support	Although I don't think we need many new properties we do need a neighbourhood plan to avoid what is happening in Cheshire, building to the west of Biddulph will help balance out the town.	A Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared for Biddulph Parish.
PO790	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD067	Support	I support the inclusion of BD067 in the proposal.	This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO5117	LC Millington				BD067	Support	I support the latest town boundary in its changes/from last proposal) removing expansion to the east and adding areas to the west. The town is already lop sided enough.	Comments noted. This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).
PO267 PO726 PO5778	Mr Christopher Hall Mr Philip Beech Mr E Pearl				BD067	Support		This site is not included in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation (April 2016).

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (housing site BD067)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	GB Amendment	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6024 PO5474 PO6631 PO6383 PO7806 PO7822 PO7414 PO8334 PO9669 PO4017	Mr T Barker Mrs J Moxon Mr Ronald Bailey Mr P Squires Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg Mrs E Shufflebotham Mr J Banister Mrs S Bennett Mrs P Hancock Mr D Woodward							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5079	Mrs L Neate				BD068	General comment	As stated above the level of homes in Biddulph area is at a saturated level. Moving west makes much more sense.	Comment noted.
PO6352	Mr V A Bainbridge				BD068	Object	The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes private properties (experienced by 34, 36 and 38 Essex Drive). Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. 1. "The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance." SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrence's being 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and environmental Agency were forced to clear the pollution. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities & SMDC to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. It contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: "The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is "appropriate for its location" in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution." SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17000 residents. The population of Biddulph as it 2011 census was 19892 residents. An increase of 885 houses approximately 3000 people will obviously require investment in its facility. This will not be facilitate by the inclusion of numerous small development site, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to utilize the CL. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt	• United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • Noise and odour assessments have been produced on behalf of the landowner and received by the Council recently. Noise mitigation measures are recommended which could potentially be implemented as part of a development scheme – no odour mitigation measures are considered necessary. • Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. • Site BD068 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD068 for release from the Green Belt provided that exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. • The site boundary can be amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site. A planning application would still be needed before this (or any other) site could be developed and the Environment Agency is a statutory consultee. • The Highway Authority consider that "the development of the site is acceptable subject to access design and visibility splays. Access is likely to need to be close to the bridge in order to meet visibility standards. Footway should be provided on the frontage to connect to the existing footway. Possible improvements to Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road junction. May be appropriate to

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. 1. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed...“will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk...” 2. The site is in Flood Zone 2 3. The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. 4. Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the new development as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. 1. The feeder road (Essex Drive) is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – 7.5m and 7.8m sequentially (Standard = 10m) 2. The feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) are both below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m and 4.7m respectively (Standard = 5m) 3. The distributor road (Mow Lane) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.25m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Essex Drive off Mow Lane is restricted from both directions by bridges with a maximum width of 5.15m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. 4. The junction of Mow Lane with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) – measured at 23m. 5. The junction spacing’s and convergence at Congleton Road are far below highways design guidelines. (Standard = 40m opposite and 80m adjacent.) (Mow Lane and Halls Road are 0m adjacent and Smithy Lane opposite is 18m). 6. Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. 7. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “ Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development.” This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. 1. Improvement works to the	realign Marsh Green Road to provide visibility to plot BD087 if possible and if agreement can be reached between owners”.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. 2. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development.	
PO328	Mr Dave Boothroyd				BD068	Object	Green Belt Review. Land adjacent to the Sewage works. I oppose any suggestion that areas BD068, BD087 and BD062 should be designated as possible areas for development or that their Green Belt status be changed. In view of recent correspondence with United Utilities, suggesting strongly that development should not take place adjacent to wastewater treatment (sewage) works on the grounds of environmental health concerns of problems with smells and noise, it is clear that these areas must never be built upon. I quote from their message, made in a letter dated 26 th May 2016: - “We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works.” It is possible, of course, that local land-owners may wish to sell their land for development outside the current Housing Allocation scheme. The planning officers would have to oppose the granting on planning permission on the above grounds. If these areas were firmly designated as Green Belt, the planning authorities would find the refusal of planning permission a far easier case to argue if the Green Belt status is maintained. Wildlife Habitat: - I refer to the Wildlife Habitat Survey on behalf of SMDC of 2014. http://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/pages/Front%20Cover%2C%20Introduction%2C%20Appendices.pdf This survey gives scientific and quantitative support to the everyday observation that the areas are a thriving wildlife habitat. The destruction of habitat is a most undesirable development. In particular, the gully and hedgerow that crosses the field BD068 is home to rabbits, foxes and badgers, many species of bird, including the rare Jay and Kestrel. Insect and plant species are plentiful and varied. Hedgerows along the brook side and the Gillow Heath/Congleton Road footpath are similarly species rich. Any aerial view of these areas clearly show that development on these areas will tend to break the wildlife corridor that links the Biddulph area with the ancient woodland areas on Baileys Bank (site of the former Biddulph Castle) and on Congleton Edge. This is bad because it threatens genetic diversity in plant and animal species by restricting the range of habitats. Agriculture: - Two of the three areas are active, productive farmland. Area BD068 in particular is being maintained and improved by the current farming tenants. The grass is fertilised, the weeds suppressed, and the land is used currently to raise two dozen heifers. It cannot be dismissed as low quality	• See response to PO6352 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. • The Council has had an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken on this site in 2015. The site has been deemed to have ecological importance due to the presence of trees with bat roosting potential, potential reptile populations and good connectivity to other biodiverse habitats. The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended prior to any potential development works being carried out: ☐ A bat survey regime to ascertain whether bats roost in the tree ☐ Reptile survey ☐ Badger survey ☐ Vegetation removal at the appropriate time of year There is no evidence at present to suggest that the site cannot be developed for ecological reasons. • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • See response to PO6352 regarding flooding.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							pasture land. Flooding: - It must be accepted that the areas under discussion have been, recently, in the past, and probably for the indefinite future, subject to flooding. According to the Environment Agency, open green land adjacent to watercourses is the only viable solution to the problem of mitigating the damage to property in the area. Green Belt status is a sensible approach to keeping flood-prone areas available to fulfil the role of 'flood plain'	
PO130	Mr Dave Boothroyd				BD068	Object	I do not believe that this is a suitable, or even possible area for housing development for the following reasons. 1: - Access. The area can only be reached by access along Marsh Green Road, which is very narrow, less than ten feet (3 metres) in width, with high banks on either side including protected mature trees. There are no footpaths on either side and for a large part, there is no street lighting. To the east of the site, travelling towards Gillow Heath, there is a narrow, very sharp, blind bend, followed by a narrow bridge crossing the cycle way. To the west a narrow bridge crosses the stream. Heavy vehicles could not use this road at all, and increased traffic would be very hazardous. Foot traffic, for children walking to school on Woodhouse Lane, for example, would be risking life or serious injury, especially during the dark winter months. 2: - Landscape and Geology. Across this land there is a deep, tree-lined gully, the bed of a former watercourse. This watercourse is now culverted, but, some water flow continues in wet weather. In the course of extensive excavations in my garden on Portland Drive, I have proved that there is a layer of clay, between 40 and 60 cm thick. It overlays a very deep layer of very soft, running sand. (Photographic evidence is available). This strongly suggests that the land adjacent to the gully is unstable. It is entirely possible that groundworks in the field could cause significant subsidence and damage to existing properties in Portland Drive and, of course, substantial claims for compensation against any possible developer. 3: - Flood Plain issues. There are powerful counter-indications against building on flood plains, highlighted by the major floods in parts of the country in recent years. The area is immediately adjacent to Biddulph Stream. When my wife and I moved to this area, our existing insurer declined our application because our postcode was flagged as an area at risk from flooding. Indeed, there have been floods on both Mow Lane and Congleton Road in the last twelve months. Every house insurer now asks prospective customers if they reside within 100 metres of a watercourse. Any owner or tenant of a house built on this area will have to answer "Yes" to that question. Any developer needs to face the same scrutiny by the Environment Agency with respect to building on the flood plain. 4: - The Sewage Works. Immediately adjacent to this area is the United Utilities' water treatment works. This would cause serious issues for any development on this area. The issues come under several headings. a. Visual aspects. A screen of trees hides the major part of the works from Portland Drive and Long Valley Road, in the summer at least. This is not the case in winter. Houses built on this area would have a clear and highly intrusive view of a huge steel structure of	• See response to PO6352 regarding highways. • Landscape Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "Site is located within the north of Biddulph, south of Marshgreen Road. The site comprises fields enclosed by residential development to the north, east and south; and sewage treatment works to the west. The site is elevated above Marshgreen Road, however it is at a similar level to the adjacent residential development on Portland Drive, and has low visual prominence due to screening provided by the surrounding development and vegetation, particularly trees surrounding the sewage works. The site forms a gap in development, and therefore fits in well with the existing settlement form. Site is of low landscape sensitivity." • If the site were chosen as an allocation and went on to be developed any damage to neighbouring properties would be the responsibility of the developer. • See response to PO6352 regarding flooding. • See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. • Screening of the sewage works would be required as part of any development on the site. • See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							pipes, valves and pumps. Frequently vital work is carried out on this structure late into the night, using powerful floodlights. (Photographic evidence is available) b. Noise. Tanker lorries are used to remove waste materials from the works. On many occasions, installed heavy machinery (probably pumping equipment) is run late at night. Based on sound meter readings taken from Portland Drive, approximately 200 metres away, the noise level on a quiet night with the no machinery running was 46dB. On a different evening when the machinery was running the reading was 65dB. At 100 metres the sound pressure level, using the inverse square law, would be four times louder, that is 12dB more thus 77dB. At 50 metres the noise level would be 89dB, a further 12dB greater. Sustained noise levels of 90dB are a health hazard. As a reference the noise level in my very well insulated house, in conditions of silence, was measured as 20dB, which is the accepted level for "peace and quiet" in a house. 89dB in their gardens would be a statutory noise nuisance and would not be acceptable to residents of houses built on this area. c. Smell. The sedimentation tanks are all enclosed now, mostly because of serious complaints from residents of surrounding roads in the past. However, this has not completely solved the problem of the emission of foul smells. They do occur in Marsh Green, Portland Drive, Congleton Road, Mow Lane and Halls Road quite often (Three times so far this year- most recently on Friday 6th May 2016) It would be a serious concern to anyone purchasing a house built only twenty metres away from the works, and could be a serious health hazard, from flies etc. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the following statement in a letter dated 26th May 2016:- "We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works." 5: - The Green Belt, and infill between settlement areas. As recently as this month, senior government figures have emphasised the importance of the green belt in preserving communities in their areas. The original intention of "green belt" was to separate and delineate areas that have traditionally been separate. This area alone represents a clear, agricultural break between the former separate villages of Biddulph and Gillow Heath. If areas BD087, BD068, BD062, BD004, BD138a and b, BD064, and DB83 were all to be developed, a pair of semi-rural communities would be engulfed and lumped together in a densely populated suburb without green spaces. The green belt would be utterly destroyed in complete negation of both past and previous government policy. Is this what is meant by "infill"? I believe that "infill" is something to be avoided, according to the guidelines. 6: - Infrastructure. Any development on this site would fall into the present catchment areas of Ox Hey first school,	application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. • The land to the north of Woodhouse Lane (west of the school) is not considered suitable for development, mainly due to the heritage impact on the nearby registered park and garden. It is also in the Green Belt. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD068. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke on Trent City Council has its own development needs to meet.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Woodhouse Middle School and Biddulph High School. Each of these is operating currently at full capacity. None of the above schools have much opportunity for expansion. Prospective developers should be clear that they will need to provide the local authorities, or other providers with sufficient funds to create new schools, on new sites, within the next fifteen years, if proposed development targets are reached. Once again, taking all of the above proposed sites together, the resulting additional traffic using either the Marsh Green Road/ Congleton Road or the Hall's Road/Mow Lane/Congleton Road/ Smithy Lane Junction, neither of which is well served by visibility would be an extra level of hazard to junctions which are already dangerous. 7: - Amenity. Development on this site will result in a great loss of amenity for residents of Portland Drive. People who bought their houses based on the assurance that the adjacent green space was green belt land forever, will be justified in firstly, opposing its inclusion in "sites suitable for development", and, should the development ever go ahead, in seeking redress for loss of amenity. It should also be noted that the vast majority of the houses on the east side of Portland Drive are single storey dwellings. Regulations require that new development should be in keeping with existing properties. If this regulation were observed, the development of the land adjacent to Portland Drive could only consist of single story dwellings. Loss of light and privacy is an additional danger. Additional Site Options: - The map of proposed sites for Biddulph shows peripheral sites around most of the current boundary, with one exception. That is land to the north of Woodhouse Lane, west of the grounds of the school, and stretching from Woodhouse Lane to the boundary of Biddulph Grange and the Country Park. There is already development on this road, and the access would be from a relatively wide road. It is a large area with few houses that would be affected by the development. Based on a comparison of the area with the Uplands development, there would be room for up to 300 houses, allowing the Marsh Green and Gillow Heath developments to be removed. It is clear that there is a large area of properly restored, former mine working land on the site of the former Victoria Colliery to the south of Brown Lees Road, and a very large area of land on the east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph Allocation with very little impact on existing residents and ready access to the main road. The preamble to the document states that some authorities have been able to agree with adjacent areas that part of their housing allocation be transferred from one to the other. It goes on to say that both Cheshire East and Stoke on Trent have no surplus land that could be considered for use by Biddulph. This is completely counter to the glaring evidence that can be gathered from a drive of no more than a mile from the southern boundary of Biddulph. There are many hectares of land lying idle and crying out for redevelopment at Chatterley Whitfield, plus a large plot on the other side of the road. A few hundred yards on the right, further along towards Oxford, there is large abandoned sports field. The entire 880	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							house allocation for Biddulph would fit into these three sites. Where is the evidence that Stoke has no land? There are many, brownfield sites (H&R Johnson?) in the Stoke on Trent area. Perhaps the developers do not like them, but the citizens like their green belt more. The citizens should be given priority. That is what community involvement means.	
PO153 PO161	Mrs Beverley Webb Mr Barrington Webb				BD068	Object	The document Historic Environment Character Assessment: Staffordshire Moorlands August 2010 page 114 indicates that BD068 appears to be the only remaining example of an Early Irregular Enclosure possibly going back to medieval times which predates the Enclosure Acts . Page 111 states ‘ Prior to the 20th century expansion of Biddulph the landscape was dominated by irregular enclosure which may have been created incrementally from the later medieval period and into the post medieval. The field pattern may have been associated with the extraction of minerals, notably coal and iron ore, which documentary evidence records as occurring in the area by at least the 14th century’ . Therefore this land should be protected as greenbelt status due to its historic value.	Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council’s Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are “There is one Grade II* and eight Grade II Listed Buildings, and a Registered Park and Garden which is also a Conservation Area within the 400m buffer. There was no public access on to the site which is elevated above Marshgreen Road, and it is at a similar level to the adjacent residential development on Portland Drive. Development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the settings of the heritage assets as development would be seen in context of the existing housing estate. Development would not adversely affect HLC zone BBHECZ 8 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms.”
PO137	Mrs D Jacobs				BD068	Object	The erosion of this green belt site will cause the North of the town and Gillow Heath to merge with no obvious boundary. The site is currently used by many (including those with young children) to safely walk dogs. It is also used for pasturing of cattle in the summer months. There are not many places in Biddulph where this can be found. It would be a great shame to take this away from the local people. Building on this site would cause traffic congestion in the vicinity. Horses are often walked up and down the narrow road on their journey to the bridal path. I'm not sure how riders would gain access if the road became busier as it would be unsafe for pedestrians and riders alike. This area of green belt is not just enjoyed by a few (as other areas of green belt around the town are). MANY people walk, cycle, jog, ride past this area on a daily basis. The erosion of the green belt on this site would affect a large number of people, making Biddulph a less desirable place to live.	- See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt. - The land is privately owned and no public rights of way cross the site. - The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways.
PO917	Mrs Dianne Simcock				BD068	Object	Sewers stink and are noisy only people forced to live here such as social housing from other areas as has happened at the former selectus site will live here The roads in this area are dangerous for pedestrians and cars. No pavements a blind bend to Gillow Heath and narrow roads. It would require significant council payers money to make them safe	- See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4962	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst				BD068	Object	To near sewage works, roads are too narrow, to support more traffic wildlife, foxes, badgers, rabbits, birds, jays and I have seen a kingfisher, cuckoo, sparrow hawks, owls and ducks. Green Belt. This field is part of our country side with public paths leading to Biddulph Valley Way, why spoil such a small area the detriment of our community – children play here, people walk their dogs. Infrastructure schools roads are already crumbling Mow Lane is a danger (traffic) no pavement.	- See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO328 regarding ecology. - See response to PO137 regarding public use of the land. - See response to PO130 regarding infrastructure including schools.
PO4894	Mrs K Hallam				BD068	Object	Do you think this site should remain included into the green belt within Biddulph and not taken out for development - yes	Comment noted.
PO4934	Mrs C Drew				BD068	Object	My main concern is to the wildlife that once uprooted will not return, also where will the extra roads be made access is very poorly made at the moment, Leave the Green Belt area alone, so many people enjoy walking, horse riding etc. and building work noise. The disruption will be very unpleasant. Also as it is so close to the sewage works what problems may arise from the constant digging and vibrations so near (no one wants problems there!)	- See response to PO328 regarding ecology. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works.
PO4933	Mr N Moxon				BD068	Object	The proposal for Essex Drive site – the wildlife + fauna will be wiped out as it is a marsh land. Near to the sewage works no one will want to live there with the smell. The road into it is not big enough to support the building transport or the volume of traffic from the houses! Portland Drive + Marsh Green Road the roads are not adequate enough to support the volume of traffic that the amount of houses will create.	- See response to PO328 regarding ecology. - See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways.
PO8299	Mr A Hague				BD068	Object	(Summary) Refer to attached forms. Object due to poor access, loss of Green Belt, close proximity of sewage works – noise and odour. Preferred sites are: old Victoria Colliery, land off Childerplay Road, mills close to town centre. All have good access to A527 and would not spoil the Green Belt.	- See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. - See response to PO130 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (in particular Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites.
PO6275	Mr J Hodgson				BD068	Object	Marsh Green Road is not suitable for traffic. The noise and the smell from the sewage works. Planned estates on a flood plain.	- See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. - See response to PO6352 regarding flooding.
PO6723	Miss L Delves				BD068	Object	Additional sites that would be suitable include the Victoria Colliery site, the land behind the Bemersley Recycle Centre. Please see the reverse for	See response to PO130 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							reasons I am against building on the site number BD068. In addition to reasons already stated. I object to building on this site because of health and safety reasons. As a current council tax payer you are failings me, my family and all the residents on Marsh Green Road, Portland Drive by building here there is no way you can ensure our safety on the roads, the pavements at the side of my property nor the capacity to widen the road and to put a potential 70 cars, at least, on Marsh Green Road, is madness and can only assume a lack of concern from yourselves. I am aware that the council receives per new house built but surely you have obligation to current tax payers. When you have been to this site have you looked yourself how much money can make and actually looked at its surrounding environment? When I tell people visit that you want to build 70 houses here they are horrified – how can the road cope? My reply “I don’t think they care” am I wrong? Lots of children /us in this area – use the cycle path etc., but you obviously have no regard for the future of our children will not be allowed out as the road will be too dangerous. If meeting the planners – it was? The land of Pennine Way had been discounted as a blurred gap between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor and that you consider Knypersley, Brown Lees, Gillow Heath and Biddulph all to be as one. This is madness; Biddulph and Biddulph are no more separate areas, like Knypersley - a great building location already on a road network and still with a massive area of space between Biddulph & Biddulph Moor. Is there a proper reason why this has been discounted? It may not look much on the map too just add 70 houses onto the back of existing ones, but the implications for the people that live here is massive. There are better locations than this. One of four officers at the planning meeting said it was only green belt because there was no need for housing at the last classification. But the fact is that that the green belt adds a fact lot of character and charm to this area. Don’t ruin it.	- See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt.
PO9670	Mrs P Hancock				BD068	Object	Access (Mow Lane) is too narrow.	See response to PO6352 regarding highways.
PO9704	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				BD068	Object	Object to adjustment of Green Belt boundary to include this site. The site has significant highway, drainage, ecology, odour and other constraints which local people will require the LPA to address.	- See response to PO6352 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO6352 regarding highways. - See response to PO6352 regarding flooding. - See response to PO328 regarding ecology. - See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works.
PO6381 PO6460 PO6233 PO6385	Mr P Squires Mr K Rowland Mrs S Goodwin Mr B Wilson				BD068	Object	I object	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6306	Mr A Gresham							
PO6210	Mrs P Newton							
PO6314	Ms S Wilson							
PO6513	Mr S Wilshaw							
PO8260	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO8501	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8119	Ms Barbara Griffiths							
PO8250	Mr C Kirkham							
PO8462	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO8443	Mrs Carol Hill							
PO8482	Miss L Delves							
PO8442	Mr Barry Aldridge							
PO8374	Mr John James							
PO8158	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO7512	Mrs L Carter							
PO7430	Mr K Flannagan							
PO7410	Mr J Banister							
PO8738	Mr Stephen Willott							
PO8758	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst							
PO8832	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8813	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbat							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8945	ch							
PO8941	R Hutton							
	Mrs E. Smart							
PO8942	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson							
PO8902	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO8694	Mrs Joan Draisey							
PO8851	Mr and Mrs F T Rowley							
PO8602	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8644	Mr R Booth							
PO8673	Mr A Malbon							
PO8714	Mr R Willott							
PO8777	Mr J Whitehurst							
PO8231	Mrs P kelly							
PO8246	Mr P kelly							
PO8319	Mrs S Bennett							
PO8545	Mr R Scales							
PO8565	Mrs J Scales							
PO8103	Mr A Forrester							
PO7744	Mr R Bradbury							
PO8394	Mr G Price							
PO7942	Mr A Lehepoo							
PO8948	Mr C Goodwin							
PO5932	Mrs Kathleen Boulton							
PO1079	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO5853	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO5726	Mrs Eileen							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5701	Smith							
PO5983	Mr Jason Eardley							
PO5989	Mr P Price							
PO6618	Mrs L Price							
	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO5970	Mrs J Ebdon							
PO5920	Mrs J Smith							
PO6575	Mr J Greatbatch							
PO6574	Mr Alec Chesworth							
PO6499	Mr K Wilshaw							
PO6276	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO6353	Mr V A Bainbridge							
PO6295	Mr J Robertson							
PO6480	Mr Gilbert Bradley							
PO6420	Mr Paul Malkin							
PO6831	Mr D Wickstead							
PO5589	Mrs S Wilshaw							
PO5569	Mr R Wilshaw							
PO5623	Mr A Barbeard							
PO5443	Mrs K Hallam							
PO6037	Mr T Barker							
PO6372	Mrs K Chaddock							
PO5530	Mr N Moxon							
PO5505	Mr M Cook							
PO5489	Mrs L Cook							
PO6910	Mr M							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6870 PO6091 PO5762 PO5954 PO5943 PO6578 PO6645 PO6440 PO6555 PO6535 PO6664 PO6203 PO7052 PO6334 PO7706	Mason Mr A Copeland Mr I Frisby Mr J Hammond Mr M Clews Mr H Ebdon Mrs Beverley Holding Ms Heather Mason Mr Norman Smith Mr Jeffrey Leese Mrs Ann James Mrs J M Slater Mrs Alison Wickstead Mr and Mrs B Carter Mr J Hodgson Mr D Bradbury							
PO791	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD068	Support	I support the inclusion of BD068 in the proposal.	Comment noted.
PO4885	Mrs J Goodwin				BD068	Support	All other comments I support fully.	Comment noted.
PO5361	Mr S Leese				BD068	Object	I think this site should remain included into the green belt within Biddulph and not taken out for development - yes	Comment noted.
PO9853 PO8297 PO7339 PO6343 PO6942 PO5890	Mr Gayle Mr R Cook Ms Emma Eardley Mr N Lunt Mr and Mrs C.B. Dodds Mrs B Bainbridge				BD068	Support	I support.	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing site BD068)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO727 PO5830 PO5808	Mr Philip Beech Mr Carl Mason Mr Christopher Slater							
PO4958	Mr Reg Grimwood				BD068	Object	The smell from the sewerage works on the 29/5/2016 was absolutely poisonous. At my house on Long Valley Road, the smell can be dreadful at times, this is going to be made worse by a further housing development of houses even closer to its boundary. The access roads in this area in Mow Lane + Marsh Green Lane are totally i.e.: unsuitable for increased volume in traffic. They are already an accident waiting to happen at the present, they were built for much gentler forms of transport.	• See response to PO6352 regarding proximity of water treatment works. • See response to PO6352 regarding highways.
PO8860	Mrs J.A. Bennett				BD068	Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1020	Mr John Hayley				BD069	General comment	I am sympathetic towards those residents living in Orme Road, and others nearby, who regard this site as a derelict eyesore and who urgently wish it to be redeveloped. Housing is needed in Biddulph, but this needs to be the right housing in the right place. In my view at least part of the housing proposed for this site is inappropriate. This garden contains English Heritage listed objects and is in very close proximity to Knypersley Hall, a Class II* listed building. This site is of great historic significance and is unsuitable for the development of such a large number of houses (30) in such a small location. This objective to build 30 high density houses is incompatible with retaining the historic character of this Victorian walled garden and with its historic landscape. This walled garden is of unique importance. James Bateman was the creator of Biddulph Grange Gardens (a National Trust visitor attraction that now welcomes almost 100,000 visitors per year). It was here in this kitchen garden that James developed his life-long love of horticulture and it was here that he grew his first orchids in specially built greenhouses. It may be feasible with careful and sympathetic design to support a modest development of, say, 5-10 houses, built in the vernacular style, and built with low elevations - a high quality development, built in keeping with the nearby Knypersley Hall. Such development must make a positive contribution to the built environment and must enhance, rather than degrade, the landscape setting for the hall itself. Both inside and outside the walled garden, this development should fully comply with NPPF policy guidelines for conserving and enhancing the historic environment (NPPF paragraphs 126 – 141). The current poor state of repair of many of the historic assets contained within the garden should not be used as excuse for their destruction, nor should it be used as a convenient excuse for change of use of this land from horticulture to housing (NPPF policy paragraph 130). Redevelopment of this site should not obstruct or interfere with reconstruction efforts to restore the original driveway to Knypersley Hall that leads NE towards Conway Road. I am deeply opposed to any changes to the town boundary and to the Green Belt status of this site. [For further details on this please see my objections to Site ADD04]. My preferred options for this site would be: 1) Development of the site as part of Biddulph's tourism strategy 2) Restoration of the site as a privately owned Victorian heritage walled garden 3) Redevelopment for horticulture use, for example, as a horticulture training centre 4) Redevelopment as a horticulture education centre, in conjunction with Biddulph High School 5) Redevelopment of part of the site as a bio-diversity site, for ecology and educational purposes, in conjunction with Biddulph High School 6) Some form of public ownership or shared public ownership 7) Some form of public access (even if only for a few	The Council's Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) assesses this site in terms of heritage and landscape impact. The results for heritage are: "There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a walled garden to the hall, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts." This study forms part of a wider evidence base to support the Local Plan. Therefore the conclusions within this report will be weighed against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of a site for development. The Council's Green Belt Review has assessed the site as follows: "Check Sprawl: Limited contribution Maintain Separation: Limited contribution Prevent Encroachment: Limited contribution Preserve Setting: Contribution Overall Impact on Green Belt Purposes: Limited Previously developed land with reasonably strong outer boundaries and which would create a logical extension to the current settlement envelope. See also Land north of Mill Hayes Road. Recommendation: Consider for release" As the land is privately owned, public access and redevelopment of the site for a training centre are unlikely outcomes.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							days each year) Destruction of this walled garden, in my view, would be a national tragedy. Biddulph calls itself “ The Garden Town of Staffordshire ”. This proposal, if it goes ahead, could sadly lead to the permanent destruction of Biddulph’s second most important garden (second only to Biddulph Grange Gardens). The National Trust commented on this proposal [BD069] at Stage 1 consultation. I endorse their conclusions and for completeness I have added their comments below: National Trust - This would entail the destruction of the remains of the kitchen garden at Knypersley Hall. While the Trust has no direct involvement in Knypersley Hall, the house was the former home of James Bateman – who created the gardens at Biddulph Grange which are in our protective ownership. The significance of the Knypersley gardens is recognized in the 2010 Historic Environment Character Assessment jointly published by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and Staffordshire County Council. This notes that the Hall is listed grade II* and the stable and coach house grade II. While the character much of the historic parkland associated with Knypersley Hall has changed in the 20 th century, some remains of the walled garden survive. These have heritage value in themselves and contribute to the settings of the nearby listed buildings. The National Trust considers that development of the walled garden would cause unnecessary harm to heritage assets and should be resisted. The Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust also commented on this proposal [BD069] at Stage 1 consultation. I agree with their conclusions and therefore have added their comments to this Stage 2 submission: Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - BD069 is the former kitchen garden of Knypersley Hall (Listed Grade II*). It is currently extremely overgrown and therefore difficult to assess. A decade ago various historic structures still survived here so the site will need careful clearance and detailed assessment in advance of any proposed development.	
PO9708	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				BD069	Object	Object to adjustment of Green Belt boundary to include this site.	Comment noted.
PO5864 PO5820 PO5697 PO5542 PO5670 PO6592	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr Christopher Slater Mr Jason Eardley Mrs M Moffatt Mr K Davies Mrs Beverley Holding				BD069	Object	I object	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6550	Mrs Ann James							
PO6433	Mr Paul Malkin							
PO5619	Mr A Barbeard							
PO5527	Mr N Moxon							
PO6851	Mrs I Latta							
PO6140	Mrs J Collier							
PO6159	Mr K Collier							
PO5719	Mrs D Whalley							
PO7335	Ms Emma Eardley							
PO6347	Mr N Lunt							
PO6806	Mr M Owen							
PO8479	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO8457	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO8098	Mr K Davies							
PO8057	Mr B Hyde							
PO8018	Mr N Goode							
PO8035	Mr K Parry							
PO7999	Mrs A Brown							
PO7294	Mrs C Dale							
PO7190	Mr A Nixon							
PO7171	Mrs G Hall							
PO7841	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7860	Mr H Whalley							
PO8846	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8640	Mr R Booth							
PO8789	Mr S Holdcroft							
PO8973	Mrs P Hindmarsh							
PO8354	Mr N Mosson							
PO7957	Mr A Lehepoo							
PO8579	Mrs J Sailes							
PO8560	Mr R Scales							
PO719	Mr Philip Beech				BD069	Support	I feel that the inclusion of BD069 as a proposed potential allocation is a very positive one. This area is in desperate need of redevelopment and the use of the land for residential development can only add value to the area.	Comments noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO786	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD069	Support	BD069 is an area of town which would benefit from a sympathetic development. I cannot see it returning to retail use and feel that the neighbouring properties would prefer a modern quality development to an unused overgrown ex retail site. I support the use of this site for development.	Comments noted.
PO5601	Mr Lewis Williams				BD069	Support	i support all the above sites	Comment noted.
PO5086	Mrs L Neate				BD069	Support	Development will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	Comment noted.
PO9024	Mr & Mrs Weaver				BD069	Support	We write in support of the proposed allocation of the above brownfield, former garden centre site for residential development, inclusion within the town boundary for Biddulph and removal from the Green Belt. We write as owners of the site since 2003. The site has been in our family since 1940s when our family moved to Biddulph. In writing this letter we have taken advice from town planning consultants and have reviewed the consultation documents available on the Council's website. The following sections of this letter establish our reasons for supporting the proposed allocation of this site for residential development, including within the town boundary and its removal from the green belt. Please take this letter as a formal response to the Site Allocations Preferred Options consultation in respect of the site and Question 15, 17 and 19 in particular. The Site and Surroundings The site extends to approximately 1.02 hectares (2.5 acres). The land is shown on the plan attached at Appendix 1 (Ref. SF498873). The site is approximately one kilometre to the southwest of Biddulph town centre, which contains a variety of shops and facilities including a library and leisure centre. The land is bounded, to the north, by Orme Road, beyond which is Biddulph High School. To the south of the site is the Mill Hays Playing Fields. To the east and west of the site are primarily residential areas. To the south west of the site is a Knypersley Hall which is a Grade II* listed building. The site is a brownfield site which comprises of a former garden centre which was in operation from the late 1960s to 2003. The site is partly covered by greenhouses, other garden centre buildings (as shown on the enclosed photograph) and extensive areas of hard standing. The buildings on site have become dilapidated and have fallen into a state of disrepair following the closure of the Garden Centre in 2003. There are also a number of trees located along the site boundaries. The Principle of Development The Council's adopted Core Strategy (March 2014) identifies a need for 6,000 dwellings in the District between 2006 and 2026. The Core Strategy commits to undertaking an early review to cover the period 2016 – 2031 to ensure that future provision will continue to meet objectively assessed needs. It also states that the Council will seek to enhance the role of Biddulph as a significant service centre and improve the	Comments noted. The Council's Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) assesses this site in terms of heritage and landscape impact. The results for heritage are: "There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a walled garden to the hall, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts." This study forms part of a wider evidence base to support the Local Plan. Therefore the conclusions within this report will be weighed against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of a site for development.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							local housing market by increasing the range of houses and allocating deliverable housing sites within the urban area and, on land adjacent to the urban area. Policy SS5B of the Core Strategy states that sites identified adjacent to the urban area of Biddulph shall be in locations which relate well to the urban area, can be assimilated into the landscape and would help secure infrastructure improvements. The supporting text to Policy SS5B states that due to the extent of green belt around the town, opportunities for peripheral expansion are limited. Therefore, it establishes that in order to meet the longer-term needs of the town, some development will be required in the green belt. It states that up to 2026 there will be a need for a minimum of 813 dwellings in Biddulph, of which land for around 200 dwellings would need to be identified in the green belt. Policy SS5B, therefore, states that the allocation of small urban extension sites will require a comprehensive review of the green belt boundary around Biddulph to accommodate the new dwellings through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and an early review of the Core Strategy. We understand that the Council has recently reviewed the position in relation to local housing need accounting for the latest Government household projections, new population and employment data. The Council's updated Housing Need report, from January 2016, concludes that the housing need for the District is between 250 to 440 homes per year between 2012 and 2031. Therefore the Council's Preferred Options document proposes an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year up to 2031. In relation to Biddulph it identifies a requirement for 1196 new dwellings (855 net) during the plan period to 2031. Therefore, we support the general growth strategy for the District and the focus on the delivery of the majority of housing and employment in the main towns, including Biddulph. We also support the proposed allocation of the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site, within the town boundary, for residential development to help contribute towards meeting the housing needs for Biddulph, for the following reasons. We understand that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that the fundamental objective of Green Belt policy, as established in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is to prevent urban sprawl. Paragraph 79 establishes that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their "openness" and "permanence". However, by virtue of the site's former use as a Garden Centre and the built structures on the site, including various garden centre buildings and green houses, it is considered that the brownfield site does not effectively serve or perform the five purposes or functions of the Green Belt established in paragraph 80 of the NPPF: " to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. ” Moreover, the edge of the site is well defined and visually contained by the existing trees and soft landscaping which are located along its boundaries. The trees and change in levels at the site boundary sever the site from the green belt to the south, in physical and visual terms. This results in the site becoming a pocket of brownfield land that is visually isolated from the main area of green belt to the south. Therefore, development of the garden centre site would result in no visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield land, such as the garden centre site, which would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it would not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. By virtue of the visual containment of the site it is considered that the redevelopment of this brownfield site for housing would not have any greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or its function and would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The land to the south of the site is not in agricultural use and is the Mill Hayes Playing Fields, which are used by Biddulph High School. It is considered that the northern boundary of the playing fields would provide a more appropriate, clear, defensible boundary for the green belt along a physical feature or use which is readily recognisable and likely to remain permanent in line with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Moreover, we note that the Council’s Green Belt Assessment, undertaken by Amec Foster Wheeler, in November 2015, confirms that the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site makes a ‘limited’ contribution to the purposes and function of the green belt, is “ potentially suitable ” for removal from the green belt and comprises: “ Previously developed land with reasonably strong outer boundaries and which would create a logical extension to the current settlement envelope. ” We also note that the Council recognises, in their Options Site Assessment document (which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document), that in order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need to be adjusted as there are insufficient sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate Biddulph’s housing requirement to 2031. In proposing the site as a preferred option for removal from the Green Belt and residential development the Council clearly considers that the site is in a sustainable location that is contiguous with the neighbouring residential area that surrounds the site to the north, east and	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							west. The Council clearly agrees with our view that the site is in an accessible location with good levels of accessibility to range of facilities on foot and by public transport. This is confirmed by the Council's site assessment which states that the site is well related to the residential area and is close to Biddulph High School and other facilities. Moreover, there are several bus stops in close proximity to the site. These are located on Park Lane and Mayfields Road (less than 300 metres walking distance from the site). The bus stops are served by a number of bus routes which provide access to the various shops, facilities and employment in Biddulph Town Centre and further afield to areas including Congleton, Newcastle and Hanley. As stated previously, the site is brownfield land and contains various garden centre buildings and greenhouses. Unfortunately, since the closure of the garden centre in 2003, these buildings have fallen into disrepair. The site has also been the target of both vandalism and arson. Therefore, it considered that the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for residential development would enable a viable use for the site and provide the opportunity for the existing dilapidated structures on the site to be replaced by a viable, secure and efficient use of the land for residential development, which would contribute towards meeting the identified housing needs for Biddulph. Given the sustainable location of the site and its accessibility to services and facilities in the town centre it is also anticipated that the site could make an appropriate contribution to meeting affordable housing needs in the district. The site is currently contained by security fencing due to the issues surrounding vandalism and arson. This gives the site an industrial appearance to dwellings surrounding the site. It is considered that the development of the site would also, therefore, provide the opportunity to improve the appearance and security of the site for residents living nearby. Technical Constraints It is understood that a suitable access to the site could be provided from Orme Road. Moreover, the development of the site would offer the potential opportunity for associated improvements to the 'un-adopted' Orme Road by a potential developer. Given the former use of the site as a garden centre is it not anticipated that there would be any issue or constraints to development in terms of ground conditions or contamination on the site. It is also understood that, given the former use of the site, and its location contiguous with the settlement boundary and nearby residential development, the site could be easily linked to mains services. The site is also fairly flat and there are no evident building constraints. According to the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. at low risk of flooding with less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding). According to the National Planning Practice Guidance	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							(NPPG) residential development is a “more vulnerable” use to flooding. The NPPG confirms that residential development would be considered an appropriate use in Flood Zone 1. The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015) also confirms that the site is in Flood Zone 1 at low risk of flooding. However, we note that there appears to be a minor error in the Options Site Assessment document, which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document, which suggests that the site is located within a flood zone. There are number of trees located within the site. However, the majority are located towards the site boundaries. Therefore, it is considered that the majority of the quality existing trees on the site could be effectively incorporated in to the design and layout of the site at a later stage. Moreover, the site is not subject to any designations relating to the conservation of ecology or biodiversity. Although the site is located adjacent to Knypersley Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building, as stated in the Council’s Site Assessment, the site is secluded and separated from Knypersely Hall by the adjacent lake and a significant number of trees and landscaping and falls outside the curtilage of the Listed Building. Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site for approximately 30 dwellings would not result in any significant impact on the designated heritage asset or its setting, subject to appropriate design. We understand that the Council is currently commissioning a heritage impact assessment, in conjunction with Heritage England, for all the sites selected as Preferred Options allocations and we look forward to reviewing the outcome of this in assessment in due course. We are not aware of any technical constraints that would prevent development of the site for housing. However, should the Council require any further technical information to consider or support the suitability of the site for residential redevelopment and removal from the Green Belt we would be willing to investigate this further and provide any information where possible. Capacity and Deliverability The site is approximately 1 hectare in area. It is assumed that it could be developed at a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare, given its rural location. Therefore, giving an indicative site capacity of 30 dwellings. This is reflected in the Preferred Options document which indicates that the Council agrees that the site is capable of delivering circa. 30 dwellings. The site is immediately available for residential development. Therefore, assuming that development of the site could commence within two years of the allocation of the site (in the Council’s Site Allocations Document which is expected to be formally adopted in 2017), following the grant of planning permission, we anticipate that the total number of dwellings would be constructed and delivered within a further year. Conclusions We trust that our responses above provide sufficient confirmation	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							of our support for the allocation of the site in the Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), its deliverability and its possible contribution to the Council's housing delivery in the short-term, given the identified shortage of housing in the District.	
PO5842	Mr Carl Mason				BD069	Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5743	Mrs Eileen Smith							
PO5648	M Mitchell							
PO6053	Mr Reg Grimwood							
PO5799	Mr Stephen Clowes							
PO6006	Mrs L Price							
PO7069	Mr C Kisicki							
PO6658	Ms Heather Mason							
PO6454	Mr Norman Smith							
PO6678	Mrs J M Slater							
PO6198	Mrs Alison Wickstead							
PO7047	Mr and Mrs B Carter							
PO6827	Mr D Wickstead							
PO5779	Mr E Pearl							
PO5565	Mr R Wilshaw							
PO5393	Mrs S Harper							
PO5409	Mr G Harper							
PO5439	Mrs K Hallam							
PO6033	Mr T Barker							
PO6966	Mr K Allen							
PO7017	Mrs D Stuttard							
PO5485	Mrs L Cook							
PO5471	Mrs J Moxon							
PO6905	Mr M Mason							
PO6886	Mr G Mason							
PO6086	Mr I Frisby							
PO6068	Mr R Blood							
PO6103	Mr D Cantrill							
PO6122	Mrs J Frisby							
PO5758	Mr J Hammond							
PO5966	Mr M Clews							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5374	Mr S Leese							
PO6509	Mr K Wilshaw							
PO6290	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe							
PO6492	Mr Gilbert Bradley							
PO6364	Mr V A Bainbridge							
PO6639	Mr Ronald Bailey							
PO6612	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO7393	Mr and Mrs D P Pass							
PO7540	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs							
PO6413	Mr P Squires							
PO6472	Mr K Rowland							
PO6927	Mrs J Brennan							
PO6701	Mrs D Cook							
PO6246	Mrs S Goodwin							
PO6399	Mr B Wilson							
PO8274	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO8515	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8133	Ms Barbara Griffiths							
PO8429	R Hutton							
PO7937	Mr C Kirkham							
PO8496	Miss L Delves							
PO8392	Mr John James							
PO8154	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8188	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8169	Mrs Angela Turner							
PO7237	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7503	Mrs L Carter							
PO7569	Mrs G Weston							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Housing Site BD069)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object /General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7425	Mr J Banister							
PO731	Mr Philip Beech							
PO8734	Mr Stephen Willott							
PO8754	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst							
PO8917	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO8936	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer							
PO8875	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO7897	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7922	Mr J Swindell							
PO8598	Mrs R Knapper							
PO8669	Mr A Malbon							
PO8710	Mr R Willott							
PO8775	Mr J Whitehurst							
PO8208	Mr D Smith							
PO8227	Mrs P Kelly							
PO8242	Mr P kelly							
PO7717	Mr D Bradbury							
PO7800	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8293	Mr R Cook							
PO8540	Mr D Neal							
PO7879	Mrs J Banister							
PO8116	Mr A Forrester							
PO8409	Mr G Price							
PO8892	Mr M Clews							
PO8961	Mr C Goodwin							
PO9676	Mrs P Hancock							
PO9858	Mr Gayle							
PO5502	Mr M Cook				BD069	Support	I support	
PO5420	Mrs L Cook				BD069	Support	I support	

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Site BD117)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1215	Mr P And Mrs J Dowson				BD117	Object	I object as this greenbelt and should stay as such. Where is the entrance going to be if this is changed for mixed use? Surely the land by Fast Far (opposite side) is more sustainable as there is already a access opposite The old Matador pub. Thus keeping mixed building use on one side of the road. Mill Hayes Road is already a rat run for the new housing estates Park Lane.	- The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review (published in 2015) to assess all the Green Belt in the Staffordshire Moorlands and determine whether it may be suitable for removal from the Green Belt to meet the District's future development needs to 2031. For this site, it was concluded that the overall impact of development on the Green Belt would be limited. 'This site would infill land between Mill Hayes Road and the A527 Tunstall Road. As such, the land is reasonably well bounded, although smaller boundaries to the east and north are hedgerows. (See also land to the north of Mill Hayes Road). Recommendation – Consider for release – Release under exceptional circumstances, should be accompanied by extension of the Town Boundary.' - The site entrance is likely to be off Tunstall Road in proximity to the Victoria Business Park on the other side.
PO1214	Mr M Brassington				BD117	Object	The proposed development encroaches onto natural underdeveloped land. This will encourage encroachment in the future towards green way bank Country Park and eventually linkup to the Knypersley hall area. The natural greenbelt boundary to the east of Tunstall road has clear & open country park & the far ridgelines. This is a essential to the general impression upon entering into Biddulph Ford (Stoke on Trent urbanisation) & Biddulph. This site is a high value green Belt space (site) giving a clear separation with Stoke on Trent. Developing this will encourage strip development and no clear green belt break. The development should be placed to the west of Tunstall Road previously developed open cast lane.	Refer to PO1215 regarding Green Belt Review.
PO5867 PO6056 PO6595 PO6009 PO5673 PO5545 PO6553 PO5588 PO5568 PO5622 PO5442 PO6036	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr Reg Grimwood Mrs Beverley Holding Mrs L Price Mr K Davies Mrs M Moffatt Mrs Ann James Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw Mr A Barbeard Mrs K Hallam Mr T Barker				BD117	Object	i object	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Site BD117)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6969	Mr K Allen							
PO5504	Mr M Cook							
PO5488	Mrs L Cook							
PO6909	Mr M Mason							
PO6889	Mr G Mason							
PO6869	Mr A Copeland							
PO6090	Mr I Frisby							
PO6106	Mr D Cantrill							
PO6143	Mrs J Collier							
PO6162	Mr K Collier							
PO5722	Mrs D Whalley							
PO5761	Mr J Hammond							
PO6495	Mr Gilbert Bradley							
PO6642	Mr Ronald Bailey							
PO6402	Mr B Wilson							
PO8518	Mrs Gillian Flannagan							
PO8460	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan							
PO8157	Ms Janet Lawton							
PO8101	Mr K Davies							
PO8060	Mr B Hyde							
PO8038	Mr K Parry							
PO8002	Mrs A Brown							
PO7980	Mrs C Hensor							
PO7297	Mrs C Dale							
PO7235	Mrs L Goodwin							
PO7193	Mr A Nixon							
PO7174	Mrs G Hall							
PO7844	Miss L Siddorn							
PO7428	Mr J Banister							
PO8849	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO8939	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer							
PO8877	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO8693	Mrs Joan Draisey							
PO8601	Mrs R							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Site BD117)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8643 PO8245 PO8672 PO8713 PO8792 PO7720 PO8976 PO8357 PO8337 PO8563 PO8582 PO7877 PO7762 PO7959	Knapper Mr R Booth Mr P Kelly Mr A Malbon Mr R Willott Mr S Holdcroft Mr D Bradbury Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr N Mosson Mrs S Bennett Mr R Scales Mrs J Sailes Mrs J Banister Mr R Bradbury Mr A Lehepoo							
PO1042	Mr G Cooper				BD117	Support	Seems a obvious area to remove from the green belt.	Comment noted.
PO720	Mr Philip Beech				BD117	Support	I support the use of the area of land known as BD117 for development. This area of the town is under developed currently, so developing this area can only be positive. Development of this area is likely to have a minimal negative impact on others, hence my approval.	Comments noted.
PO789	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD117	Support	I support the inclusion of BD117 in the proposal.	Comment noted.
PO796	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD117	Support	I support the inclusion of BD117 in the proposal.	Comment noted.
PO5604	Mr Lewis Williams				BD117	Support	i support all the above sites	Comment noted.
PO6830	Mr D Wickstead				BD117	Support	i support	Comment noted.
PO5845 PO5746 PO5823 PO5700 PO5802 PO6661 PO6457	Mr Carl Mason Mrs Eileen Smith Mr Christopher Slater Mr Jason Eardley Mr Stephen Clowes Ms Heather Mason Mr Norman				BD117	Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Site BD117)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6572	Smith Mr Jeffrey Leese							
PO6681	Mrs J M Slater							
PO6202	Mrs Alison Wickstead							
PO7050	Mr and Mrs B Carter							
PO6436	Mr Paul Malkin							
PO5782	Mr E Pearl							
PO6855	Mrs I Latta							
PO6071	Mr R Blood							
PO5968	Mr M Clews							
PO5377	Mr S Leese							
PO6510	Mr K Wilshaw							
PO6293	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe							
PO6615	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales							
PO7397	Mr and Mrs D P Pass							
PO7338	Ms Emma Eardley							
PO6416	Mr P Squires							
PO6475	Mr K Rowland							
PO6930	Mrs J Brennan							
PO6249	Mrs S Goodwin							
PO8277	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO8136	Ms Barbara Griffiths							
PO8432	R Hutton							
PO7940	Mr C Kirkham							
PO8478	Mr B.W. Newton							
PO8499	Miss L Delves							
PO8192	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst							
PO8172	Mrs Angela Turner							
PO7544	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs							
PO7813	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg							
PO7509	Mrs L Carter							

Question 17 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt amendments for Biddulph? (Site BD117)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	GB Amendment	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7571	Mrs G Weston							
PO8737	mr Stephen Willott							
PO8757	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst							
PO8920	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO7900	Mrs S Sharrock							
PO7925	Mr J Swindell							
PO8776	Mr J Whitehurst							
PO8211	Mr D Smith							
PO8230	Mrs P kelly							
PO7803	Mr R Hindmarsh							
PO8296	Mr R Cook							
PO8543	Mr D Neal							
PO8411	Mr G Price							
PO8963	Mr C Goodwin							
PO9677	Mrs P Hancock							
PO9859	Mr Gayle							
PO732	Mr Philip Beech							
PO5651	M Mitchell				BD117	Support	I support.	Comment noted.
PO6350	Mr N Lunt				BD117	Object	I object.	Comment noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO71	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				BD076/BD076A	General comment	Depending upon the type of retail. We do not need any more supermarkets.	Comments noted. The Council's Retail Study (published in 2013) recommends that the Council allocate a site to accommodate a discount foodstore to provide more choice for local shoppers as currently Sainsburys is the only large supermarket in the town. Evidence suggests that a high proportion of Biddulph residents still shop out of town for their main food shop and it is considered that a greater choice of supermarkets would help to reverse this trend.
PO495	Mr Denver Johnson				BD076/BD076A	Support	Apparently there is going to be a super Aldi built in Biddulph - not a day too soon! Role on the conversion of the Sainsbury's into a giant Netto!	Comments noted.
PO769	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				BD076/BD076A	Object	Biddulph's high street needs to be regenerated, not retail units/parks built to further close the few shops that remain (not helped by allowing Sainsburys to sell everything).	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. The Council's Retail Study (published in 2013) recommends that the Council allocate a site to accommodate a discount foodstore to provide more choice for local shoppers as currently Sainsburys is the only large supermarket in the town. Evidence suggests that a high proportion of Biddulph residents still shop out of town for their main food shop and it is considered that a greater choice of supermarkets would help to reverse this trend.
PO549	Mr Terry Barber				BD076/BD076A	Support	The retail environment in Biddulph is dying, with many private shops closing in the High Street. At least three new stores are needed, a discount foodstore would be one, with an additional clothes store and shoe shop at least as additional requirements.	Comments noted.
PO653	Mrs Siobhan Perry				BD076/BD076A	Support	This area is close to the town and the bypass and would be close enough to support housing development in that area.	Comments noted.
PO765	Mr Paul Malkin				BD076/BD076A	Support	It makes sense to use this land for development if extra retail units are required, with easy access to the A527 and the town centre and will also not negatively impact current residents	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1340	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			BD076/BD076A	Object	BD 076a, covered by FID 226, part of FID 25 and part un-surveyed. District ecological value, biodiverse site. BD 076 covered by FID 25 - district ecological value, biodiverse site. These should be assessed against the Staffordshire LWS criteria. There are also a number of species-rich hedgerows identified by the surveys.	ECUS Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. They concluded that both sites had the potential to support protected species. The site habitats on both sites were considered to be of nature conservation value at local and site level. Further survey work was identified as a requirement for both sites. On site BD076 more information is required regarding the species rich hedgerow and the presence/absence of reptiles on the site in order to establish SBI/ BAS status. On site BD076a further investigation of the presence/absence of reptiles on the site is needed. If these sites are taken forward as allocations, policy wording will require the survey work to be undertaken in order to inform any planning application for development of the sites.
PO2781	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			BD076/BD076A	General comment	The following comments highlight sites where we consider there may be issues relating to contaminated land. BD076a: According to information held by the Environment Agency, these sites are located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	The Council's Environmental Health section has advised that there is possible landfill in the North West part of the site. Any developer would have to undertake investigative work to assess contamination risk and remediate land where required. This will be an additional development cost. This will be raised in the Local Plan policy for the site.
PO2886	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			BD076/BD076A	General comment	The site is adjacent to, or overlaps with a Biodiversity Alert Site. Design and layout should avoid impacts in this site, enhance it where possible, and maintain linear habitat connectivity.	Comments noted. These requirements will be incorporated into the Local Plan policy for this site.
PO5198	Mr Peter Brittain				BD076/BD076A	General comment	Western development will be balance the town.	Comments noted.
PO5137	Mr Gary Harding				BD076/BD076A	General comment	Biddulph bypass benefits Biddulph building on the west side.	Comments noted.
PO5253	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				BD076/BD076A	Support	Everything considered it would seem a more cost effective development.	Comments noted.
PO5231	Mrs I E Sefton				BD076/BD076A	Support	Developments of employment sites appeal to offer excellent opportunities to further development of businesses.	Comments noted.
PO5251	Mrs J Sutton				BD076/BD076A	Support	I support the need for further retail and business's within the town centre supported by an increased pedestrian traffic that could easily access the town from the western development sites.	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5127	Ms Lynne Evans				BD076/BD076A	General comment	The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comments noted.
PO5131	Ms Lynne Evans				BD076/BD076A	General comment	The old railway track has many more access routes that lend themselves to making developments here far easier, this area would avoid the problems experienced around the new uplands mill developments, with its squeezed together look and unattractive outcome.	Comments noted.
PO4610	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD076/BD076A	Support	BD076, BD076a – recommended for inclusion.	Comment noted.
PO5342	Mr D Heath				BD076/BD076A	Support	The west side of the bypass lends to the better development to support the town.	Comments noted.
PO5355	Mr D Heath				BD076/BD076A	Support	Building to the west side also closer to the Chatterley Whitfield site understood to create 2100 jobs. Being able to walk via the railway line.	Comments noted.
PO5283	Mrs S Purcell				BD076/BD076A	Support	i agree	Comments noted.
PO5290	Mrs S Purcell				BD076/BD076A	Support	i agree	Comments noted.
PO5291	Mrs S Purcell				BD076/BD076A	Support	i agree	Comments noted.
PO5306	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson				BD076/BD076A	Support	All these comments are sensible and constructive, and we agree with them completely.	Comments noted.
PO5111	Mr Cottrell				BD076/BD076A	General comment	These sites should have been used for residential building before employment site. No one would come to Biddulph to open a business.	There is demand for employment land in Biddulph. These sites would be developed as part of a wider regeneration opportunity including land to the south to bring forward a large strategic mixed use regeneration site which is well related to the town centre and its key services and facilities. An assessment of employment land requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land was required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. It was recommended and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) was taken forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan. An employment land requirement of approximately 27ha was therefore recommended up to the year 2031 for the Preferred Options Local Plan on the basis that it was at the top of the OAN range

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								for employment and so closely corresponds with the proposed housing requirement to support sustainable development. Applying the 20% requirement for Biddulph wards in Pol SS3 Core Strategy gives a requirement for the town of at least 5.4ha, less qualifying 2014-17 employment commitments. A range of employment site choices have been selected for Biddulph – either close to the town centre (i.e. this site) or to the existing Victoria Business Park.
PO5087	Mr J Neate				BD076/BD076A	Support	Development the Biddulph Town Centre will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	Comments noted.
PO5106	Mr J Neate				BD076/BD076A	Support	The recommendations regarding the Market Days/dedicated market area/link the Excellent.	Comments noted.
PO5107	Mrs L Neate				BD076/BD076A	Support	The recommendations regarding the Market Days/dedicated market area/link the Excellent.	Comments noted.
PO5088	Mrs L Neate				BD076/BD076A	Support	Development the Biddulph Town Centre will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	Comments noted.
PO5153	Mrs P Alcock				BD076/BD076A	General comment	The sites being developed to the west of Biddulph could benefit from the new retail sites and would be in easy access and walking distance	Comments noted.
PO5175	Mr S Sneyd				BD076/BD076A	Support	i support this	Comments noted.
PO5171	Mrs K Sneyd				BD076/BD076A	Support	i support	Comments noted.
PO5162	Mr N McQuade				BD076/BD076A	General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comments noted.
PO5213	Mrs L McQuade				BD076/BD076A	Support	The town centre should be treated as.	Comments noted.
PO5204	Miss F McQuade				BD076/BD076A	General comment	The town is dead for younger people/update pls.	
PO5227	Mr I Seabridge				BD076/BD076A	Object	Disagree ‘pie in the sky?’	Comments noted.
PO5241	Mrs P G Webb				BD076/BD076A	Support	The town centre developments needed many more shops would be very welcomed.	Comments noted.
PO5245	Mrs P G Webb				BD076/BD076A	Support	New primary school is desperately needed/i strongly support the proposals here.	
PO5321	Mr D Lovatt				BD076/BD076A	Support	i support	Comments noted.
PO5349	Mr I Barber				BD076/BD076A	Support	Regeneration of the town centre can only be achieved if the High street was made pedestrian zone, if the town was more attractive you can attract more visitors with Biddulph Grange Gardens to spend there.	
PO5296	Mr S Findlow				BD076/BD076A	Support	i support	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5299	Mr S Findlow				BD076/BD076A	General comment	But not sure about closing the High Street to traffic. The elderly residents of the Pennine Way estate + the Washington Close area desperately need a round robin' mini bus service to help to get to the doctors and the shops and the dentist etc.: say from 9am – 3pm, it could be enterprising taxi service to set this up to help the elderly attend appointments. I strongly feel that the health infrastructure would be under great strain with such an increase in the population. I work at the local dental practice and we simply cannot cope with any more patients. We have to turn people away on a daily basis.	Comments noted. Your suggestions about the mini-bus service are outside the remit of the Local Plan. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals (including health infrastructure). It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO5268	Mrs A Bridgette				BD076/BD076A	Support	The bypass offers better development sites: It was designed that way. There would be better balances to the town. It is better to develop the town centre, making it more balanced Building here to the west is closer to the proposed site Chatterley Whitfield, gives the opportunity to the health centre and the town amenities.	Comments noted.
P010291	Mr Chris Millington					Support	Makes sense to build retail to the south and the west where according to the core strategy houses should be built.	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9042 PO9041	Gallagher Developments Ltd	Gallagher Developments Limited	Mark Rose	Define	BD076/BD076A	Object	My clients would object to a mixed use and employment allocation of 3.5ha in the northern part of Core Strategy Broad Area 4 (BD076 / BD076A). There has been a long standing allocation on that site, and they have marketed it for employment and commercial uses for over 10 years without success. Their firm view is that residential development is the only viable use on the site, and as such the entire site should be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan review. That course of action is explicitly supported by the NPPF which states (para. 22) that “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.” Indeed, the Employment Land Requirements Study states (para. 8.4) that: “Whilst adopted and emerging Local Plan policies may seek to safeguard against the loss of employment land to other uses it is likely that, over the course of the plan period, some land will be lost to alternative use (for example where they are no longer suitable for employment use). In accordance with the Practice Guidance, market signals should be used by the LPAs as a guide to whether losses in certain areas will be appropriate or not.” It later (para 8.18) states: “any new provision should ensure that the layout, location and type of space is attractive to the market rather than purely focusing on the quantum of space delivered”. Furthermore, it is questioned whether the need actually exists for an employment allocation on this site in Biddulph. The consultation paper refers to an employment land requirement of 35ha in the District (para 3.16) which is in the middle of the range identified in the Employment Land Requirements Study (para 7.108: 25-45ha). However, the Study states: “it is recognised that the labour supply projections which link to the Objectively Assessed Housing Need are towards the lower end of this range. Whilst it has been acknowledged that there is not a direct causal link between housing and employment land requirements, there is nevertheless a need to	See response to PO5111. A masterplan would be set out incorporating this land and neighbouring land to establish a suitable layout for the scheme. Refer to site policy in the Preferred Options Local Plan for further details.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							ensure that the two dovetail together to avoid any unsustainable outcomes'. Moreover, in relation to Biddulph specifically the consultation paper identifies a residual employment land requirement of only 1.95ha in Table 3.3, and a need for a 1000m2 discount foodstore in Table 3.4, but then proposes the allocation of a total of 10.24ha of employment land in and around the town. Consequently, in relation to Broad Area 4, given the clear lack of market interest in employment or commercial uses on the site, and the over riding need to increase the housing land supply in town as highlighted above, it is contended that these areas in the site should also be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan review as part of the wider site allocation.	
PO362	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				BD076/BD076A	Object	Wildlife, beautiful scenery.	Comments noted.
PO9647	Mr D Copeland				BD076/BD076A	Support	Need to bring more employment opportunities into Biddulph.	Comments noted.
PO9695	Mrs P Hancock				BD076/BD076A	Support	I support.	Comments noted.
PO10048	Mr Philip Sutton				BD076/BD076A	Support	I support the need for retail around the town centre within walking distance of the proposed development sites on the west side of the bypass.	Comments noted.
PO10247	Mrs Angela Turner				BD076/BD076A	Support	In terms of ecology, this is classed as District value. A high proportion of the land is poor (70%) but the land to the north and eastern edge contains important habitats. This area should be considered for designation as Visual Open Space.	See response to PO1340.
PO9861	Mr Gayle				BD076/BD076A	Support	Support	Comments noted.
PO4590	Mr I Botham				BD117	Object	I recently attended a meeting at Biddulph Town Hall where the Parish Councillors now decided at the eleventh hour to get involved in this process that's been going on since 2009. There decided outcome of the meeting (that was predominantly about Akesmore Lane proposed site) was to propose that housing development should take place on an extension of the Victoria Business Park on what was previously the Victoria Colliery Site and on land at Childerplay Road, and to oppose all building in Green belt (despite both these sites being in Green Belt). I would question whether either of these sites are actually in Biddulph? As i have always been told by the SMDC council that my property is the boundary between Stoke and Biddulph. In my opinion development of Childerplay	An assessment of employment land requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land was required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. It was recommended and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) was taken forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan. An employment land requirement of approximately 27ha was therefore recommended up to the year 2031 for the Preferred Options Local Plan on the basis that it was at the top of the OAN range for employment and so closely corresponds

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Road is remote to the town and creates sprawl into the Green Belt, whilst I feel that the old Victoria Colliery would make an extension to the Victoria Business Park, keeping the industrial units in Knypersley (Brown Lees on the site of A527) Therefore releasing my site for residential development that everyone else seems to oppose in their area. My site is a infill site between Victoria Row and houses in Mill Hayes Road and New building's, it would be easily accessed via adaption of the traffic light junction to Victoria business Park, I hope that you will give this careful consideration, in any event I confirm that the land is fully available for development.	with the proposed housing requirement to support sustainable development. Applying the 20% requirement for Biddulph wards in Pol SS3 Core Strategy gives a requirement for the town of at least 5.4ha, less qualifying 2014-17 employment commitments. A range of employment site choices have been selected for Biddulph – either close to the town centre or to the existing Victoria Business Park. This site (as shown in the 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet') includes your land has been selected primarily for employment use as it has good road links and is well related to Victoria Business Park so is likely to be attractive to businesses to help meet the employment needs of the District. It is proposed that there will also be a residential element to meet housing needs and assist with the viability of the scheme as a whole. A masterplan will be created to look in detail as to which land uses could occupy particular parts of the site.
PO10275	Mrs C Williams				BD117	Object	Land South of Victoria Row Area not suitable for industrial units as it would impact on the landscape. Approaching Biddulph from the south with industrial units both sides would be an eyesore and not in keeping with the character of Biddulph. Other more appropriate sites are available West of Tunstall Road. Would increase HGVs, traffic turning onto Tunstall Road, should 3 way traffic lights are proposed this would cause more delays. Would, eliminate any future expansion off Mill Hayes Sports and recreation ground.	The Council's Landscape Impact Study states "Large site comprising fields on the southern edge of Biddulph, east of the A527 (Tunstall Road); south of Victoria Row; and north and west of Mill Hayes Road. Residential properties and a smallholding are located on the A527 and are enclosed by the site. The site is opposite Brown Lees Industrial Estate, which is located on the opposite side of the A527. However, despite this, the site is rural in character. The agricultural buildings enclosed by the site and the cottages on Victoria Row contribute to this character. The site is large and open with high visual prominence, particularly in the north and east of the site, with long distance views available from the footpath on the northern boundary. Visual prominence is lower in the south-west of the site, south of the existing properties on the

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								A527, where the land is enclosed by trees and hedgerows. The landscape sensitivity of the site is low in the south-west, increasing to the north-east corner of the site where sensitivity is highest. In order to limit potential landscape impacts the existing vegetation in the south-west of the site should be retained, and additional planting could be undertaken on the edges of, and within the development, to create a strong vegetated edge and soften the appearance of the development in long distance views. Limits on the size and scale of buildings would also soften the appearance of the development.” The Council must balance the evidence it has in considering this land for development.
PO83	Mr Robert Moseley				BD117	Object	NO further retail is need, there are plenty of empty shops in biddulph.	The Council's Retail Study (published in 2013) recommends that the Council allocate a site to accommodate a discount foodstore to provide more choice for local shoppers as currently Sainsburys is the only large supermarket in the town. Evidence suggests that a high proportion of Biddulph residents still shop out of town for their main food shop and it is considered that a greater choice of supermarkets would help to reverse this trend. BD117 is not however, proposed for retail use – the relevant site is BD076a which is on the edge of the town centre.
PO362	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				BD117	Object	Wildlife, beautiful scenery.	Comments noted.
PO179	Mr Kingsley Rowland				BD117	Support		Comments noted.
PO324	Mr Frank Cottrell				BD117	Support	These sites should be used for residential building	See response to PO4590.
PO154	Mrs Beverley Webb				BD117	Support		Comments noted.
PO162	Mr Barrington Webb				BD117	Support		Comments noted.
PO140	Mr Carl Webb				BD117	Object		Comments noted.
PO269	Mr Christopher Hall				BD117	Support		Comments noted.
PO292	Mr David Spruce				BD117	Support	Location on edge of town. Away from town centre and close to current employment area.	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1019	Mr G Cooper				BD117	Support	Would it not also be a good idea to use the new access road in that would be required off the VBP traffic light junction to access the larger southern area of the ADD04 previously proposed for 250 houses via Mill Hayes Road near the small fishing pool. This must surely be a more viable proposition than ADD03 where there does not seem a obvious point of accessing this site for a future proposal of 300 houses because Akeshire Lane would not be suitable. This would concentrate all the investment in one area & would also seem to have a smaller impact on the town than some of the the other proposed sites going by the numbers of objections received. Also this whole area seems a better proposition for removing from the green belt than other areas according to the green belt review. thanks for reading	The Council must balance all the evidence it has in deciding which sites to take forward for development in the next draft of the Local Plan.
PO689	Mr Ian Turner				BD117	Object	Got quite enough retail buildings which are disused and not sustainable. Building more in the area of housing and recreation is disgraceful and stressful to the people living in the vicinity	Retail development is not proposed on this site. It is proposed for a mixture of housing and employment.
PO455	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				BD117	Support	The town centre needs developing towards the west side to assist retail, it also needs to be more attractive.	Comment noted.
PO470	Mrs Jean Wrench				BD117	Support	Support	Comment noted.
PO632	Mrs Amanda Reed				BD117	Support	Support	Comment noted.
PO660	Mr Andrew Perry				BD117	Object	This area is close to the town and the bypass and would be close enough to support housing development in that area.	See response to PO4590.
PO772	Mr Paul Malkin				BD117	Object	could this land not be used for housing only to minimise the impact on green belt and on current residents of Biddulph	See response to PO4590.
PO787	Mrs Anne Barnsley				BD117	General comment	Site BD117 - Situated on the A527 on the outskirts of the town - this site has currently been identified as a "Potential Suitable Employment Site". However, in view of the fact that there are vacant units, plus scope for expansion on the Victoria Business Park, I feel that this site is more ideally suited for consideration as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site". In addition, I would also suggest that land on the left-hand side (from the A527) of Childerplay Road is also considered as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site".	See response to PO4590.
PO778	Mrs Jayne Beech				BD117	Support	I support the use of BD117 for employment and development. The southern end of the town already has Industrial estates, so additional retail and industrial use would not be out of place here. This makes good use of the land, as all of the industry is within one geographic area, and not dotted about here and there.	Comments noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO957	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				BD117	Support	Support	Comment noted.
PO968	Mr Christopher Goldstraw				BD117	Support	Support	Comment noted.
PO853	Mrs Andrea Millington				BD117	Support	Building to the West is closer to the potential £0.5 million business development at the Chatterley & Whitfield site understood to offer the opportunity for creating 2,100 jobs. It is also closer to the already planned new employment areas than other sites. Makes walking to work possible and more attractive against the likelihood of going by car from sites north of it, especially with their less direct routes.	Comments noted.
PO918	Mrs Dianne Simcock				BD117	General comment	Insufficient. we need more jobs to sustain the current population.	See response to PO4590.
PO1318	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			BD117	General comment	(Summary) With regards to site references ADD04, BD069 and BD117, these sites appear likely to discharge to that area served by Severn Trent for the provision of wastewater services. It would be useful to confirm with the respective landowners the likely point of discharge to the wastewater network from these sites so that we can confirm the receiving wastewater infrastructure and therefore better understand the impact.	Points of discharge to the wastewater network are a detail which can be confirmed at a later stage in the process once the sites have been allocated in the Local Plan and detailed development schemes become available at the planning application stage.
PO2914	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			BD117	General comment	Site BD117 ideally should be extended to cover entire unbroken frontage of A527 to provide access in conjunction with Victoria Business Park	Comments noted.
PO4609	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD117	Support	BD117 - Access must be from Tunstall Rd, recommended for inclusion.	Comments noted. The Highway Authority agree that the access should be from Tunstall Road.
PO9646	Mr D Copeland				BD117	Support	Need to bring more employment opportunities into Biddulph.	Comment noted.
PO9694	Mrs P Hancock				BD117	Support	I support.	Comment noted.
PO10047	Mr Philip Sutton				BD117	Support	I support the need for employment around the town centre within walking distance of the proposed development sites on the west side of the bypass.	Comment noted.
PO10078	Ms Heather Mason				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10072	Mr Norman Smith				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10140	Mrs Anne Young				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10089	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10102	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10069	G B Ford				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10020	Mrs C Cliffe				BD117	Object	Object.	Comment noted.
PO9999	Mr D Cliffe				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10128	Mr R Meadowcroft				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.

Question 18 – Do you have any comments on the proposed retail and employment sites in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10114	Mrs V Whiston				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10045	Mr D Platt				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO10035	Mrs E Platt				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO9860	Mr Gayle				BD117	Support	Support.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO386	Mrs Margaret Fowell				General comment	I am concerned that the proposed housing allocation will have a detrimental effect on the Haydon Park estate. I believe that the land off Akesmoor Lane is mined and there are underground streams. Water run-off is already a problem in some parts of the estate and I think this can only get worse if the building plan is implemented.	- The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed.
PO2592	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2780	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The following comments highlight sites where we consider there may be issues relating to contaminated land. ADD03: According to information held by the Environment Agency, this site is located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	It is considered that although this matter will require more detailed investigation at the time a detailed scheme is being developed, it is an additional development cost rather than an issue which would prevent development from taking place.
PO4580	Mrs M Smith				General comment	Poor access from existing roads, on to a very narrow lane. The old train line is a national cycle route as well as a bridle way and a walkway. The development may have an impact on the traffic through Haydon Park making safety an issue as well as congestion. An alternative site may be the disused Victoria Colliery Site – excellent access to the A527 and is on a bus route.	- The Highway Authority has no difficulties with the principle of development in this location. Improvements needed to the road network as a result of development would need to be identified through a Transport Assessment. - The BVW is a very significant attribute in the town and part of a national Sustrans cycle route. Therefore any development in the area would be built around it. The route is generally buffered by trees and hedgerows. All new development bordering the route would be required to provide pedestrian and cycle links on to it. The Council has produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy and the BVW is identified within this document. It is not considered that development in this location would impact on the enjoyment of the route and long ranging views (e.g. to Mow Cop) and the wider countryside would remain. - Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like ADD03. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4581	Mr & Mrs E Prudem				General comment	After living next to Wharf Road for the past 41 years we know better than anyone how busy and popular our lovely Biddulph Valley Way has become for cyclist, runners, walkers, horse riders et: how could anyone consider spoiling this amenity, by building houses and a school next to it. Also we have grave concerns about the wildlife in this area - would spoil their habitat. Akesmore Lane is very unsuitable place to build a school and houses, it has very poor access, has a lot of surface mining and prone to flooding which has affected some property on Hayden Park. Surely there are more suitable sites than this one which could be found i.e.: Victoria Colliery has been suggested or others. We hope so.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact. • Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD03 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended] • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO386 regarding Mining. • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage. • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay.
PO4586	Mr G Bloor				General comment	I do not feel that the proposed development off Akesmoor Lane provides a suitable place to relax the Green Belt. Problems over access to and from and what are the needs sorry that says we need housing and a school? Biddulph Town is almost built up to the Town Boundary. Build on Brown Fields.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites.
PO4618	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			General comment	ADD03 - Further investigation is required for this site. It needs to be put out for consultation and comments and see what is the response. Remove narrow northern strip and enter via Wharf Rd off roundabout, recommendation TBD.	• Comments noted. This table shows the response to the consultation on this site.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9005	Mr J Turner				General comment	Please do not let them build on the field behind at the field at the end of my road because we make dens there and we play and we play in out street and do not want anyone to get ran over, the stream is very near and I like to the nature and the animals in the field.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology.
	Petition with 450 signatures				Object	We the undersigned object to the development of the greenbelt land above, on the grounds of: 1. Unacceptable encroachment into the greenbelt, and destruction of natural habitat 2. Loss of open space and visual amenity along National Cycle Route 55 (Biddulph Valley Way) 3. Poor access creating unacceptable increase in traffic on narrow country lanes (Hall Rd, Wedgewood Lane, Mow Lane; Akesmore Lane), with dangerous junctions and lack of suitable footpaths 4. Loss of setting for listing buildings within the proposed development area	• In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site ADD03 for release from the Green Belt. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology. • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "There is one Grade II Listed Building within the site. The setting of the asset contributes to the overall significance of it and would need special regard for its preservation. Development would be highly likely to cause adverse effects to its setting. Therefore, any development should be restricted to the southern part of the site only and mitigation should include the use of vegetation screening to reduce adverse effects to its setting. Whilst the HEA states that zone BBHECZ 18 cannot absorb significant change, development to the south of the site would be a small change to the zone as a whole, and with appropriate development, this could be accommodated on the site (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site is suitable for development in heritage terms, subject to suitable masterplanning; if development is restricted to the southern part of the site only and with appropriate screening." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.
PO20	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	This is Greenbelt land, with a long standing man made feature setting the appropriate boundary. No further encroachment should be made up the valley sides into the Green belt.	• In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site ADD03 for release from the Green Belt.
PO40	Mrs Emma Hallen				Object	The housing will destroy green belt land which should be protected from development. Access from akesmore lane and mow lane crossroads would be a problem - volume of traffic and cars edging out of a dangerous crossroads.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO72	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				Object	We think that there are sufficient sites to build additional housing without using green belt land	See response to PO regarding using brown field land first (including mills).
PO84	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	This is beautiful, pictureque greenbelt that serves the whole community and more as people walk, cycle, run, toddle along the old railway line.	- See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
PO10279	Cllr Chris Wood				Object	I also reject the sites at Akemoor Lane ADD03 which is completely ridiculous in terms of access it is a narrow country lane which has 3 streams running through it, there are numerous mineworks in the area and the main point is that Biddulph is known as the garden town and the Biddulph valley way is an important aspect on the eyeline when approaching Biddulph and this incursion into the green belt goes against the fundamental principles of the green belt review, this site was added at a late stage and should be ruled out as completely unsuitable.	- See response to PO4580 regarding highways. - See response to PO386 regarding Mining - See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - The Local Plan production process, by its very nature, involves several stages of consultation at which point anyone can suggest further sites for inclusion in the plan and the Council decides on whether they are appropriate. This site was suggested as part of the site options consultation.
PO87	Mr James Baskeyfield				Object	Regarding the proposal to build 300 houses and a school on greenbelt land off Akemoor Lane, Biddulph, my wife and I strongly object for the following reasons This is a Developers Charter and not in the interests of Biddulph. It appears that the planners at SMDC have no respect for the Council Tax payers of Biddulph West. It is obviously a desperate and badly thought-out idea. This beautiful area of greenbelt land, with the view West from the Biddulph Valley Way, will be ruined. Have the planners considered the access difficulties in narrow, winding Akemoor Lane? During the building process local residents would be subjected to noise, parking of builders' vehicles and machinery. Afterwards there would be noise from the school, a lot of extra traffic, plus parking in the cul de sacs on Haydon Park by parents of the schoolchildren. We do not believe Biddulph needs any more housing or schools adding to the urban sprawl and pressure on local services. The Biddulph Valley Way was always meant to be a division between local development and the greenbelt. SMDC is blatantly disregarding their original policy.	- See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO4580 regarding highways. - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. - See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO445 PO840	Mr Gerard Hearson Mrs Ruth Hearson				Object	The number of houses being proposed for ADD03 is unclear. This website refers to 60 houses, yet other sources refer to ' up to 300 ' houses. If it is known that there are plans to build up to 300 houses on ADD03, then this website should make that clear and not appear to be hiding the fact. Our property in Smokies Way backs on to the bridleway (old railway line) and overlooks the beautiful green fields of ADD03. The assurance that this was green belt - and would therefore not be built on - was a major consideration when purchasing the property. To build here would ruin this unspoilt view and considerably devalue our property. The detrimental impact on the thatched Whitehouse Cottage (Grade II listed building - English Heritage Building ID: 275237) which is situated in ADD03 cannot be overstated. If this proposal goes ahead, consider the incongruous site of a Late 15th Century cottage in the middle of a 21st Century housing estate and school. There is also the added danger to the thatched cottage of vibration from construction traffic and an increased risk of fire to/from any new houses or school. Access to a school and houses in ADD03 is a major concern. Akemoor Lane is very narrow and its dangerous bends and soft verges makes it prone to regular accidents and frequent near misses. It's also in a constant state of poor repair with an uneven surface and damaging pot holes etc. It has high hedges that restrict vision for drivers and there is little or no street lighting, road markings or footpaths. The road itself often has mud on it and this can make driving treacherous, especially in wet conditions. School buses will add significant congestion and increase the risk of a serious accident. The notoriously dangerous and difficult cross-roads of Akemoor Lane/Biddulph Road and Tower Hill Road is already a major hazard for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. Again, the risk of a serious accident will increase as more people drive to and from any new houses or school. It is assumed that there will be a need for other access roads to ADD03 - though these are, as yet, unannounced. Even if Smokies Way does not become an official access road, the likely impact on Smokies Way (and its nearby residential streets) is a major concern. This will inevitably turn our quiet cul-de-sac into a noisy and busy 'drop zone' on school days, as parents on the school run pull up (perhaps park up?) to allow their children quick access to the proposed school, by crossing over the bridleway. Note the old mine workings in ADD03 which are prone to collapse. The potential for sink holes also makes this site particularly unsuitable for a school and homes. Consider the potential damage to wildlife - and the conservation implications. ADD03 has ancient trees and is home to various birds, badgers, foxes and other small animals. A field in the lower part of ADD03 is also currently rented by local farmers to graze cattle and sheep. The accompanying sounds (and smells!) add to the sense of living in the country and help to make living in Smokies Way the	• The Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation Document lists the site as accommodating 60 houses and a new first school. This is an indicative number and clearly if the Education Authority decided that the first school was not required in this location, the Council could decide to increase the number of houses on the site. There will be two further public consultations and a public examination before the plan is adopted so any changes made would be open to comment. • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "There is one Grade II Listed Building within the site. The setting of the asset contributes to the overall significance of it and would need special regard for its preservation. Development would be highly likely to cause adverse effects to its setting. Therefore, any development should be restricted to the southern part of the site only and mitigation should include the use of vegetation screening to reduce adverse effects to its setting. Whilst the HEA states that zone BBHECZ 18 cannot absorb significant change, development to the south of the site would be a small change to the zone as a whole, and with appropriate development, this could be accommodated on the site (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site is suitable for development in heritage terms, subject to suitable masterplanning; if development is restricted to the southern part of the site only and with appropriate screening." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						delight it is. Ducks can often be seen on the areas of water caused by the flooding fields , particularly adjacent to the Old Station House just off Halls Road. The proposed ADD03 development also poses a real flood risk to properties in Smokies Way. Many new buildings in ADD03, with large areas of Tarmac, block-paving, slabs and other hard surfaces will increase this risk to Smokies Way, as it becomes more difficult for surface water in ADD03 to drain away. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the tranquil and beautiful setting of at least one public footpath and several streams in ADD03. Views from the renowned Staffordshire Way will also be spoiled. Consider also the Biddulph Valley Way (and National Cycle Path N55). This is used extensively by walkers, ramblers and cyclists from both inside and outside of the area and the stretch alongside the proposed ADD03 site is one of the most beautiful. The views across to Akesmoor Lane and towards Mow Cop etc will be simply ruined by the plan to build up to 300 new houses and a school.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO274	Mr C. Henwood				Object	Thatched White House: Oldest cruck frame construction in Biddulph. Vibration damage from construction vehicles and danger of fire A British Listed Building: Cottage Late C15, altered mid C19 and C20. Timber frame on sandstone plinth: wattle and daub and painted brick infill. Norfolk reed roof. Developed open hall and down house with C17 (originally ceiled) bay added to right, C30 additions to sides and rear. Listing NGR : SJ8787058066 Staffs 1580 Biddulph Whitehouse 29106 Cruck type D open hall SJ C Cottage, Gillow Norton with fire Hood ?(no smoke 878570 Heath blackening on the hall timbers Biddulph Valley Way: National Cycle path NSS ad Bridleway . Part of the moorlands recreation resource (classed as open public space) and extensively used by walkers and bridle ways ass Roads: Prone to accidents, narrow frequent accidents and near misses. Esp Wedgewood Lane and Tower Hill. Akemoor Lane is in a poor state off repair, pot holes from agricultural vehicles. Old mine Workings: site of a historic mine workings and an old bell pit workings. Prone to sink Holes Warf Road: Costly to convert to normal access road as it crosses the BVW and is the site of very old girder construction railway bridge Wild life: Sites off ancient Trees. This area home to habitat off many mammals and birds including birds and badgers, fox's and species of owls. Footpaths: a number of virtual footpaths crossed this land and are used to access the national foot routes eg: Staffordshire way and Gritstone Way. School: Access and Parking around these are already narrow and bending roads would cause a dangerous area for parents and school children. School bus access would be difficult and invite accidents. Local Farm Problem: At least one farm in this area regularly burns rubbish causing nocuous smells, causing problems for people with asthma's. This would affect the children in the proposed new school. Heavy farm vehicles use these roads a lot especially during planting, harvest and silage cutting. Mud and debris are frequently left on the road surface making is dangerous if driving incautiously.	• See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • If development takes place on this site any protected trees would be preserved unless there are exceptional circumstances in which case re-planting would be required. Soft landscaping would be integrated into any scheme. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage. • The problem of a local farm burning rubbish is being dealt with separately by the Council.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO216	Mrs Rowena Jukes				Object	I would like to object on the following grounds: There doesn't seem to be enough evidence that all potential Brownfield sites have been explored for development before Greenbelt has been proposed for inclusion on the plan. For example, there are a number of derelict Brownfield sites on Station road, which could be used as an alternative. The road infrastructure around this proposed site cannot cope with the demands of weekend league football matches. Therefore, housing on this site would compound the situation and potentially make the roads around this area unsafe. There is a Grade II Listed building on the proposed site. Building here would destroy the habitat of numerous species of wildlife that are established in the area. The train lines that run through where the proposed development site is attract a lot of people, not just from Biddulph. If houses and potentially a school are built on the site, this would discourage people from using it. Neighbouring councils have made agreements to transfer some of their housing allocation to other authorities who have excessive derelict Brownfield sites. Why is this not being considered as an alternative before using Greenbelt sites? To say that this is because there is a need for housing cannot be justified as the recent development on the old Select us site could not sell all of the houses privately and so 60% of that is now social housing. How many of this 60% is used for the social housing needs of the Staffordshire Moorlands? If those houses are being offered to other authorities to help to meet their social housing alternatives because Staffordshire Moorlands have met their social housing needs, then there is no further need for housing in Biddulph. Therefore, the inclusion of any of the Greenbelt sites is not justified.	• See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Neighbouring authorities including Stoke and Newcastle Councils have their own development needs to meet. • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO295	Mr Peter Benn				Object	When I purchased a property on Smokies Way I obtained a Coal Mining Report from the Coal Authority that stated that it "is in an area where coal is believed to exist at or close to the surface that may have been worked at some time in the past". Also, 'the property is within the likely zone of influence on the surface from two seams of coal at approximately 70m and 190m depth, the last date of working being 1880.' I also have a copy of a report on disused mine shafts in the vicinity of The Parkway (Smokies Way) prepared for Tay Homes Ltd. This shows the location of several disused mine shafts on the site. Given the close location of the proposed Akesmore Lane development to Smokies Way it would seem highly likely that that land would also be subject to past mining.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO346	Miss Gemma Docksey				Object	Re ADD03 Akesmore Lane As I have mentioned in other comments to previous questions on this matter, taking such a huge chunk of Green belt back for residential use is inappropriate. Building a potential 300 homes and a school on plot ADD03 would have a huge impact on the leisure industry i.e. Route 55, it will have a massive impact on the amount of traffic using the country lanes of Gillow Heath. I have been told that the roads would be improved however it is not just Akesmore Lane and Station Road which will feel the impact. Station Road already has issues with no off road parking causing congestion and making the junction with Dorset Drive dangerous to get out of. (this is a piece of road which could not be widened due to buildings on both sides) All of the other roads in the area would have an increase in passing traffic. Halls Road is torturous at the weekends already due to the lack of parking for the weekend footballers and their families. On most weekends tractors and large vans/lorries cannot get down the road due to parked cars, the thought of being able to get an emergency vehicle to anyone on the road or them accessing Gillow Heath that way is unthinkable and a worry already. Please don't add more traffic to this already dangerous situation we are put into continually. Could we reduce the acreage used on Akesmore lane and utilise the area closer to the bypass, this could potentially have access from the bypass and reduce the hazards we already face in Gillow Heath. Again I understand more homes need to be provided however why are you wanting to use huge chunks of land at a time. Why not develop smaller areas around the borders of our town. This is not a case of not wanting development near me, it is a case of why do we need to do so much in such large areas. spread them out, build on Brown belt land, utilise the old buildings i.e. the old mill on Station Road. Do smaller development more evenly dispersed, providing the same quantity of homes but leaving less of an impact on specific areas of the town.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • A range of sites are proposed in the plan both large and small to meet Biddulph's housing needs. It would be unrealistic to identify all small sites for Biddulph as the Council is required by the Government to demonstrate that sites they identify will actually be built and smaller sites tend to be less viable.
PO688	Mr Ian Turner				Object	This is a rural area with heavily used public walkways used for leisure. Also, the roads are not able to take further traffic and maintain the rural aspects of existing properties in the area	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO416 PO417	Mrs Shirley Foster				Object	The proposed plans for the site off Akesmoor Lane in Biddulph will completely decimate the local flora and fauna. The proposed site is home to many species of plants and wildlife including bats, bats are a protected species and it is against the law to disturb and resting or breeding sites, the below has been taken directly off the government website: What you must not do You're breaking the law if you do certain things including: deliberately capture, injure or kill bats damage or destroy a breeding or resting place obstruct access to their resting or sheltering places possess, sell, control or transport live or dead bats, or parts of them intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it's in a structure or place of shelter or protection Either or both of the following could happen if you're found guilty of any offences: you could be sent to prison for up to 6 months you could get an unlimited fine Activities that can harm bats Activities that can affect bats include: renovating, converting or demolishing a building cutting down or removing branches from a mature tree repairing or replacing a roof repointing brickwork insulating or converting a loft installing lighting in a roost, or outside if it lights up the entrance to the roost removing 'commuting habitats' like hedgerows, watercourses or woodland changing or removing bats' foraging areas using insecticides or treating timber The conservative manifesto also clearly states the following: on page 51 ensure local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt. Also Page 52 it again clearly states: We will protect the Green Belt We have safeguarded national Green Belt protection and increased protection of important green spaces We have abolished the Labour Government's top-down Regional Strategies which sought to delete the Green Belt in and around 30 towns and cities and introduced a new Local Green Space planning designation which allows councils and neighbourhood plans to give added protection to valuable local green spaces	• See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO775	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				Object	The proposed housing allocation numbers would be reasonable as long as they were targeted in the right areas, ie Victoria colliery and Childerplay being prime areas for development. Biddulph Valley needs to be protected and we need to stop tearing up greenbelt land. The current infrastructure cannot cope now, never mind with such a vast increase in the number of residents - trying to get a GP appt is a joke at the moment (they have been unable to fill one position at the surgery for the past 2years). Trying to get in and out of Biddulph for work is a nightmare - effectively there is really only one road through. High Peak officers ought to try and get to work from here!	• See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO380	Mrs Jacqueline Baskeyfield				Object	I object to any greenbelt land around Biddulph being used for building, in particular the site off Akesmoor Lane. The officers at SMDC should listen to Biddulph Councillors who know that this land contains mine shafts and is prone to flooding. Also, Akesmoor Lane is completely unsuitable for any more traffic. Surely the Environment Agency and Staffordshire Highways Dept will not agree to this poorly thought out scheme. Why not approach Newcastle under Lyme Council to discuss the possibility of building houses on the brownfield Victoria site?	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO216 regarding building in neighbouring authorities instead
PO490	Mrs Lynda Cotterill				Object	I object to the proposed housing and school development off Akesmore Lane The reasons for my objection are:- Narrow roads, difficult access to Akesmore Lane Use of greenbelt when other sites are available eg Victoria colliery site, factories around the town centre eg Minster Mill on Walley Street, derelict mill on Station Road etc This area is sorely in need of redevelopment to improve the look of the town and is close to the town centre Meadows Way- potential site for housing, also I believe there is land in Brown Lees on offer for sale for housing development General point - green belt land is needed for health & wellbeing of residents. Losing the rural nature of land around the town centre and destroying the sensitive and unique nature of Gillow Heath would be unnecessary and potentially destroy the attraction of that area.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills)

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO757	Mr Paul Malkin				Object	Save Biddulphs Green Belt Firstly I would again like to comment that the Councils marketing of this consultation has been extremely poor, it has been left to residents associations and concerned residents to spread the bad news in their community. As council tax notices were sent to all residents a few weeks prior to the consultation starting then I would have expected the promotion of an important issue like this to have been included in that delivery. I feel SMDC have missed a real opportunity to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to produce a North Staffordshire plan that could deliver the required housing whilst protecting green belt and identifying brownfield sites to continue to regenerate the area. When I asked if this had been considered at the Biddulph consultation meeting the council officer advised me that this had not been considered as "nobody wants to live in Stoke". I find this attitude from a council officer pretty appalling and if this is the attitude of the planning team then no wonder an innovative partnership approach had not been considered. Stoke have been successfully regenerating and redeveloping brownfield sites in the area for many years and I believe SMDC could learn a lot from their approach. In addition Stoke and Newcastle are where the job opportunities are being created and many residents of Staffordshire Moorlands will travel there for work and leisure and probably would want to live in these areas. The proposed sites for development are not only in green belt areas, but also along the boundaries of existing residents. The sites are going to have a detrimental impact on current council tax payers of the district who purchased properties at an inflated rate due to overlooking beautiful open fields. These residents are not only going to lose their beautiful views but also thousands of pounds from the value of their homes. I propose a number of sites that will have a minimal impact on the green belt and current residents. The Mills in Station Road and Walley Street are in desperate need of repair or regeneration. These could either be developed into apartments for young first time buyers or older persons or demolished and new properties built. This accommodation is far better situated close to the town centre and will keep the area more in keeping of the newer properties around them. There is also old brownfield land available either side of Congleton Road in Knypersley, the former Victoria Colliery site and the land behind Bemersley recycling centre off Childerplay Road. All of these sites have much better access to the main roads than the proposed sites that are all reliant on single track country lanes. What is required locally is housing to meet the needs of local people, there are key issues to address, young people can not get onto the housing ladder and have to resort to renting that can cost more than mortgage payments and there is an ageing population that require housing to meet their needs. What I would expect the planning department to complete before any	• See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use. • See response to PO216 regarding building in neighbouring authorities instead • See response to PO2044 regarding lack of employment • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • It is agreed that affordable housing is needed locally – the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment and housing needs surveys assess the numbers and types of houses needed. Site ADD03 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes so will contribute to this need. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						development plans are signed off is a thorough research project to identify what is actually required locally, what is affordable to the local community and what the mix of starter homes, shared ownership and social rent homes should be. The Housing and Planning Bill has recently been passed and this includes the development of starter homes for first time buyers as part of the affordable housing requirement. These homes can be for sale up to £250,000 outside of London. Local salaries of young first time buyers would not make these affordable, SMDC must ensure that affordable homes to purchase are for sale at a price that local people can afford. The type of houses that are required should also be researched, surely the requirement is for smaller affordable homes, 1 bed apartments for singles and couples and older people to downsize to and then 2 and 3 bed homes for young families. I also made a freedom of information request to the district council with regard to the recent development at Uplands Mill in Biddulph asking for the breakdown of owner occupation, shared ownership and social housing and how many nominations had been made for local people to the social landlord, unfortunately this has not been provided in time for me to include this within this response. The reason I made this request was to be able to identify if there was a need for social housing in Biddulph or if the housing association had to widen its search for tenants to the north west, which I believe to be the case. This land should not be considered due to its impact on the green belt, the sewage works and the local highways, the roads are not built to meet the demand of all this additional traffic without making it dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike.	
PO1338	Ms K Dewey	Staffords hire Wildlife Trust			Object	Site ADD03 has not been covered by the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys.	Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on site were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. However, further surveys are recommended of the semi-natural broadleaved woodland present along the brook as this could qualify as an SBI under the Staffordshire guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. Some species are listed as important in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines and therefore the site does currently qualify for consideration as an SBI or as a BAS under these criteria. However, prior to any future development the site should be checked again for signs of badger and activity surveys should be conducted to better determine use of the site by bats, especially along the eastern boundary. It would be necessary to conduct nesting bird checks before vegetation clearance or other disturbance during the bird breeding season. These requirements can be

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							included in policy if the site is selected for development.
PO1006	Mr J Hopkins				Object	The site off Akesmore lane is by the council on strategic availability assessment June 2015 deemed inappropriate due to flood issues, aside from the traffic – issues the proposal development would create. Much better to build on land (ex industrial off Brown Lees Foundry, Biddulph people don't care if this the town closer to stoke if this protects the Green Belt!! The consultation process poor – A complex process without proper explanation to local people, lots of maps, Jargon and false district council representatives who were besieged on the evening. Not good enough	• See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. The consultation period for planning documents at statutory stages is 6 weeks. This consultation was held over a longer time period. Responding on the Council's website by using the consultation portal was an option but there were other ways of responding too – by email, completing a form or letter.
PO842	Mr Alan Brown				Object	First of all I would like to congratulate the council on creating a green artery that runs through the heart of Biddulph, however with the development of ADD03 it looks like the planning department are trying clog this up which if allowed to happen would go alongway to destroying one of the most beautiful shortwalks anywhere in the county. The proposed development would also encroach on the oldest (14th Century) and a grade 2 listed property in Biddulph. what do English Heritage have to say about this? Also the proposed building of a school in ADD03 would make Dorset Drive and all the surrounding streets a car park.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO916	Mrs Dianne Simcock				Object	The roads in this area are dangerous for pedestrians and cars. No pavements and narrow roads. The junction with Towerhill Road is dangerousIt would require significant council payers money to make them safe	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO926	Mrs Dianne Simcock				Object	People who live in Biddulph have to work out of town. Like other colleagues we think if greenbelt is built on it will destroy the area. We will move to pay our council tax in an area nearer work such as Newcastle under Lyme where although built up there are more facilities, jobs and less travelling time than carry on travelling to Biddulph with few facilities, lack of advance education and leisure activities for our children.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1132	Mr and Mrs G Davies				Object	We wish to object to the proposed development at Akesmore Lane Biddulph for the following reasons: There are unrecorded mine workings on the site. Akesmore Lane has problems with flooding at times it is impassable. Any development of this site may cause problems for existing properties adjacent to the site. Access to the site is difficult, there is no existing road suitable for access to the site. Construction vehicles would cause problems on the existing roads. Access for residents and emergency services to the finished development would be difficult. Access to the proposed school within the development would be difficult as there is no route to the site from the town centre that has a continuous footpath. Parents taking their children to and from the school will cause problems on the narrow roads in the area. The Biddulph Valley Way is a great asset to Biddulph. It is used by many Biddulph residents and brings tourists into Biddulph. This development would have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife and turn this section of the Biddulph Valley Way into a footpath through a housing estate. The former brown field site at Victoria Colliery is a more suitable site for development. The land has been reclaimed and stabilised for development, this site has no access problems and should be considered for development before any other site in Biddulph. The sewage treatment plant in Biddulph is currently working over its design capacity. This is causing pollution problems in Biddulph brook. These environmental problems should be resolved before any housing developments are approved in the Biddulph area.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph.
PO1427	Mrs Barbara Forster				Object	Why when I live only approx. 100m from this site did I not know anything about this site until Monday 9/5/2016 when a friend phoned me to tell me? Planning officer could not answer this? Why was this not on the plan last year. 2 weeks have passed already of your? Period this we cannot get back. Access beautiful narrow lane listed building maybe one of the oldest in Biddulph. Thatched cottage. Wildlife – badgers owls – Tawney and brown, blue bells kestrels, buzzards etc Green Belt Have all other brown fields site been built on Akesmoor Lane Floods – water already runs into hayden park Cycle route 55 Access on to halls road on a bend Beautiful brooks .	• See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO1420	Mr J Mountford				Object	Ideal site brown lees industrial est	• This is an existing employment area and will be retained as such.
PO1421	Mrs H Cain				Object	to akemore lane site ideal site old victoria colliery site and childerplay road site	• See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO1422	Mrs D Bott				Object	the akemore lane site is not suitable for houses and a school ideal sites would be the old victoria colliery site and child play road.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO2029	Ms Jane Garner				Object	I object strongly to this proposed development for the following reason; It will completely eradicate the countryside location of this side of town bordering the attraction that is Biddulph valley way. Increased traffic volume will massively affect all adjoining streets, roads, lanes. One of which is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders. Station Road is already dangerous, especially at the weekend when the football is on the playing fields. Dorset drive estate (Haydon Park) will suffer increased traffic cutting through causing a hazard to children playing fields when the children are playing football. Etc. on the open spaces. Why on earth don't planners look at dissipating additional housing across various pockets of the town instead? Why do we need another primary school? Can't the others expand slightly? If another primary school is built to accommodate these dwellings, there wouldn't another middle school be needed to? Biddulph should not become an urban sprawl. I with no lack of regard for retaining its garden town status, situated in a pleasant valley.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • A range of sites are proposed in the plan both large and small to meet Biddulph's housing needs. It would be unrealistic to identify all small sites for Biddulph as the Council is required by the Government to demonstrate that sites they identify will actually be built and smaller sites tend to be less viable. • Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet).
PO2044	Mrs K Everitt				Object	I am writing for the proposal for the building of 100's of houses and a school at Gillow heath area. I have lived here along with my partner for 11 years and find it very peaceful, agreeable place to live. The proposed plan would add approximately 300 hundred houses and a school to the green belt land that is a beautiful backdrop to biddulph and would encroach on the small area of Gillow Heath, which is still classed as a village. This would be completely out of character of the neighbourhood. The much urban sprawl and prevents biddulph from becoming burgeoning town, with even more housing developments blighting the landscape. Views of beautiful fields stretching from Biddulph Valley. Way up to Mow Cop, define the spectacular beauty of this peaceful location. The forfeiture of any of our natural open countryside would be lost for ever, much to the detriment of the current and future generations. If biddulph must have more houses, surely there must be a suitable area in which to build them. One that's close to a local footpath or possibly within the eye line of a historical folly. The Biddulph Valley way Is utilised regularly by walker, cyclist, horse riders and rambling clubs alike. Families with children enjoy strolling and spending quality time on this tranquil rural footpath. What a pleasure would these derive from looking out onto houses, with the inevitable noise more residents would obviously bring to this area? The proposed development, which borders the very edges of biddulph valley way, in parts, would have a detrimental effect on a well-used and much loved escape from modern living. It is necessary environment, where 1 in 10 can relax amid the peaceful atmosphere and enjoy the benefits of strolling through the pleasant countryside. The government suggest we take more exercise, amid our busy working lives and the biddulph valley way is a perfect area to do this and must not have any of its air of	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "Large site on the western edge of Biddulph, comprising agricultural land and two farmsteads (Moodystreet Farm and Hollylane) and sheds, enclosed by Akesmoor Lane to the west. The site is located beyond the dismantled railway, which currently forms a strong, vegetated settlement edge and limit to development. The site is inter-visible with the Green Belt to the west. Development within the site would encroach on the surrounding countryside, and would adversely affect the existing settlement edge. Development of the site could potentially compromise the surrounding sensitive countryside, as there would be no clear limit to development beyond the site. Site is of high landscape sensitivity." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • If the district council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. • New employment areas are also proposed for Biddulph in the draft Local

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						tranquillity disturbed by the building of more houses. This extra house, school and obviously the residents would cause an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours. More and more people are being housed within a close proximity so no wonder, on occasions, this will cause problems, both socially and environmentally. People need the green open spaces. They need to be able to sit quietly in their gardens at the end of a hard day's work, and not have to listen to cars flying by or unavoidable noise a larger population would bring. Surely this development would be adversely affecting the intrinsic environment value of the local landscape. The green rich greenbelt provides a natural mechanism to absorb the damage caused by carbon emissions. This benefit would be lost under the proposed development, as building on this vital environment would weaken these natural defences. New houses with the increased population of the impact on this area. The additional vehicles on the local roads will also negatively impact the area. These small roads will become busy and there will be an increase in air pollution. Biddulph is a small town with not much by way of employment within the immediate area this would mean those who go to work have no alternative but to use their cars, the public transport isn't very efficient either, so realistically more and more people shall need to use their cars more and more, thus more carbon emissions. Even now car parking spaces are somewhat limited and difficult to find and appointments with Dr's further stretched. If the population were to grow by such a number! Biddulph is the 1 town that consists of lovely close community. This high street is still full of traditional shop where people will stop and pass the time of day. It's a place to enjoy returning at the end of the working day. As I drive up to Halls Road, the beauty of the countryside nearby never fails to move me. For this very reason and for those outlined above, I trust that these objections will be taken fully into account before embarking on a project that would see the begins of turning Biddulph into another faceless town	Plan. See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)
PO4653	Mr J Turnock				Object	I understand local authorities are under instruction from government to build more houses, but I object to them using our beautiful green fields that's borders on the most beautiful and popular walk and cycle way (55) in the district, used by hundreds of local and not so local people, this seems incredible, in places it would be Biddulph Valley Way in an urban corridor and not the enjoyable asset it is today. The government tell us health and fitness is important to our wellbeing so the Akesmore Lane proposal would take away the enjoyment of the country walk's or rides. Would you please take note of my objection to the Akesmore Lane land and proposal?	See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4657	Mr And Mrs A Roberts				Object	With regard to the proposed developments on green belt and green field sites in all areas of Knypersley, Gillow Heath, Biddulph and Brown Lees, I am dismayed and disappointed with the plans SMDC deem to be appropriate to build on. The roads in all these areas are little more than county lanes and do experience traffic problems now which no doubt you are aware of. In Biddulph we have so many empty and derelict mill buildings yet are not in your proposed planning programme. Would it be a good idea to utilise these before extending out into our treasured countryside or is it too easy to allow developers to build on flat farm fields? Do planners actually visit the areas? They designate for building on? Every proposed house will generate 1 motor vehicles and possible 2 so I have to ask the question, do the authority have plans to upgrade the road systems? Our town centre needs to promoted to encourage present and any future residents to 'shop local' is it fit for purpose at present to attract sustainable. Our very beautiful country side is quite quickly being eaten away, open spaces will be at a premium, where will our children play? Biddulph is home to a wide variety of wildlife. Does anyone care? I am not hostile to new homes being built but they need to be sympathetic to our town and our town needs to be able to service and welcome our new residents with suitable infrastructure. Please listen and consider the views of Biddulph people.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • New development will help to support the town centre shops and facilities. • The Council requires open space to be integrated into developments of more than 20 houses including children's play facilities unless there is already adequate provision in the local area. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)
PO4652	Mr D W Swetnam				Object	I object to any objection to any Green Belt land around Biddulph being used for housing. Land passed for housing 20 years ago has not been used yet, e.g. Orme road garden centre station road Mill and Town Mills which are an eye saw to our town. New pool site (can't read the site numbers!) is poor and water logged. Land and would be the start of joining us up to Mow Cop! There is land BO117 which would be better choice near to the main road and services. Plenty of houses empty at this moment.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills)
PO4643	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst				Object	Unacceptable encroachment of Green Belt Land + area of beauty, wildlife habitats, trees, wild flowers this is a national cycle route 55. Very poor plus dangerous access along the country lanes adjoining this area increasing traffic + hazards on the increasing traffic + hazards on Tower Hill, Mow Lane, Wedgewood Lane + Halls Roads and Mow Lane. These are already very busy at rush times for their size. Flood risk – Akemore Lane old mine workings that could collapse the area is used by walkers visitors horse riders (many children horse ride in this area) cyclists – extra traffic again would be dangerous. Listed building in this area – the oldest cruck frame construction in Biddulph vibration damage from construction vehicles + danger of fire.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only)

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4658	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	I strongly object to this substantial housing development of green belt land The access in to the Northern end if walking would require pedestrians to use the both sides road to access the town. This is significantly scenic part of the Biddulph Valley Way upside of the valley for all to enjoy this development would cause serious visual impact. There is a substantial land on the open cast mine at Victoria Colliery site that would cause a far less visual impact.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4647	Mr Frank Cottrell				Object	Build on Childerplay Road and Victoria Colliery site.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4644	Mrs Margaret Cooper				Object	I would suggest that there are many alternative Brownfield sites a few miles away in Stoke on Trent that would be more suitable and that some agreement with Stoke Council could be achieved as most of the people would have to find employment in this area anyway. To build on Green Belt in the country as a small as Britain is totally wrong. By increasing urban spread and loss of wildlife habitat.	• See response to PO216 regarding building in neighbouring authorities instead • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4680	Mrs Shirley Barlow				Object	We wish object to homes being built on visible open green space off Akemoor Lane, this I totally unacceptable, as this is an area of natural beauty, it seems you want to join us up to Biddulph own down one side and Harseahead the other why? It's spoiling our town and why changes it from Pennie Way. When Roads are wide, and the Cul De Sac has an entrance in the site already, and the cards, the roads by Akemoor are totally unsuitable and would be unacceptable they are country lane and needs to be kept as so for future generation also the infrastructure cannot take more housing being built, Bovis Estate uplands mill, not selling to social housing. Keep Biddulph Green it's a lovely area that we want to keep not have a blot on the landscape. This is something we only heard about in the last 2 weeks, no letter or leaflets have been delivered, really should send out letters.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • This area was included at Site Options Stage but not taken forward due to the impact development in this location would have on the Green Belt (refer to the Council's Green Belt Review for details). • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO2044 regarding impact on Landscape • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use
PO4654	Mrs Shirley Barlow				Object	Alternative site in Biddulph: No to Akemoor Lane not suitable land object to this site/mineshafts and flooding. What about Victoria Site and Childerplay Road Knypersley. Build on Pennine Way where it was always going to be. Victoria Site is much more suitable than taking of any the countryside good links to the roads and S-O-T and Congleton also the same thing in Childerplay Road no one to really object to building on Victoria Site, and many happy Biddulph residents. Also 200 plus homes already empty in Biddulph area why do we need more when these are empty, selective site, and many more when these are empty, people who have brought these cannot sell because of the awful layout and selling to social housing organisations. Pennine Way is much more suitable as the roads are already in place and cul de sac ready for the entrance road put the school there so they are close together.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO4680 regarding using Pennine Way instead

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4637	Mr Jordan Kirkham				Object	Green Belt should stay Green Belt and not destroy an area of natural beauty. Would destroy the Habitat for wild animals. Houses on Haydon Park devalued considerably since Sainsbury's was built and would further devalue them. Fields and railway track are an excellent selling point. Dorset Drive would become more a rat run again, as it was when the bypass was being built. The small close Cul de Sacs on Haydon Park would be used for parking by parents going to the school. Trying to get off Dorset Drive at the Sainsbury's round about in the morning is a night mare now, ever min with potentially another 900 -1000 cars (300 houses 3-4 cars each property) There really is only one way in and out of Biddulph, gets gridlocked very easily. The Biddulph by pass only needs 1cm of snow in the winter to completely grind to a halt. Akesmore Lane is not adequate for more cars/housing/school and dangerous for children to walk along to the school. The Thatched Cottage on Akesmore Lane is a listed and the oldest property in Biddulph. Akesmore Lane is not adequate for more cars/houses/schools and is dangerous for children to walk along. The railway track would go from a beautiful tranquil place to walk, cycle, and ride horses to basically an alleyway between housing estates. Biddulph does not need another extra 300 extra houses – plenty of properties to buy and rent of all prices at the local estate agents. Also houses on the uplands site didn't all sell and were turned over to social housing, which people from other areas moved into fill. Biddulph does not need another school Meadows school site, James Bateman School still use the playing field there. Local amenities already under extreme pressure - i.e. GP surgeries unable to recruit more Dr's (had to recruit nurse/matron) and very difficult to get an appointment even now. The areas on the previous plans from the meeting in July 2015, i.e. Gillow Heath, Pennine Way/Woodhouse Lane, Conway Road, have all been thrown out basically pasted into Akesmore Lane. Not satisfied with the attitude of the officers who attended the Biddulph consultation event (amended).	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO445 regarding property values • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)
PO4641	Mr J Horton				Object	There is a lot of surface mining in this area which would need a lot of attention to state to safe for building. The area is prone to flooding which has caused problems to some houses on Haydon Park. Very poor access as the name suggests Akesmore Lane is a very narrow and? Not suitable for the extra number of vehicles which houses and the school would create. The road would have to cross the train lines at some point (i.e. Biddulph Valley Way). Biddulph Valley Way is a national cycle route no 55 so this would also impact on cyclist's as well as walker's horses, as well wildlife. Haydon Park would be massively affected with increased traffic and congestion as parents use Dorset Drive and the cul-de-sac off it as a drop off point to for the children going to the school. Alternative site – The old Victoria site which has excellent access does not impact on anyone and is on the bus route.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4645	Mr M Job				Object	I object to the inclusion of ADD03 (Akesmore Lane) on the Biddulph proposed development plan.	Comment noted.
PO4676	Mr S Cook				Object	I don't seem to be able to access SMDC planning site to lodge my objection to potential building on Green Belt land off Akesmoor Lane Biddulph. Whether this is by accident or design or my ineptitude at on my laptop, I don't know I always understood that Biddulph urban spread was contained by the old railway, line. The development in the 1970's bordered the boundary and the land to the west of the line was Green Belt land and consequently not for urban building upon. Those developments were necessary then as there was plentiful employment in the area at Victoria Colliery, Cowlshaw Walkers Steel Works and Selectus etc. There are now no large employers in Biddulph and so the housing requirements have diminished. I also understand that there are some 200 empty properties in Biddulph area for rent or purchase, so what is the purpose of 825 more. If this central government requirement, surely there is some logical way to appeal system and no sensible government department would impose needless building in an area that does not require or want. As a further suggestion what is wrong with including the land of the old Victoria colliery spoil that was cleared and stabilised for building some years ago, instead of our green belt land ADD03 (Akesmoor Lane). I can only assume that this land has been added to after the local council vote at a developer's behest as it would be a prime building land for expensive and large houses in our rural area. The bedroom tax forces people to pay for empty unused bedrooms in there house or move to a smaller property for those tenants to move to a smaller property to free up larger houses for family use. There are very few smaller properties for those tenants to move to surely smaller properties and bungalows should be built to allow that process to advance. If I am accused of NIMBY ism I must admit to some justification for that accusation's but my object to the Akesmoor Lane site is based on fact that it is just not I who use this area for recreation and enjoyment. A lot of people from outside the area also visit via a National Cycle path. I have spoken to several visitors about the potential development and one can believe that this beautiful area defiled with a large housing development and school. The access to this area is also difficult and Akesmoor Lane in particular would require massive development and widening. The traffic in the area would be greatly increased with the attendant road safety risks. The sewage plant at Marshgreen is already over its working capacity and would be unable to cope with the proposed developments without a large scale upgrade with all the attendant difficulties. As you will gather from the above I am against a large scale housing development of the area between in particular the proposed development of the area between Akesmoor Lane and the old Railway Line.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO2044 regarding lack of employment • Housing need is in addition to any existing empty properties • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • Any development on this site would not just be larger properties. There will be an affordable housing requirement which will need to be implemented including 'starter homes' which tend to be smaller units. • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works being over capacity

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4646	Mrs J Cottrell				Object	Build on Childerplay Road and Victoria Colliery site.	See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4648	Mr A Heathcote				Object	The proposed development is on an old and poorly maintained lane which is narrow and has several blind bad bends and is not suitable for development. It would also encourage further building on the eastern side of the valley which would be visible from the opposite site of the valley. I understand this land was not included in the plan previously for this reason, which is why the western side of the valley has been rejected.	- See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
PO4649	Mrs E Heathcote				Object	Why is this plot now being considered? In June 2015 at site assessments it appears as plot BD140, as for its suitability, the conclusion drawn was 'not considered suitable for development due to potential access difficulties and the rural character of this area! I wish to object the proposed housing site ADD03, which is sited on land adjacent to Akesmore Lane and the Biddulph Valley Way. I object on the following grounds: The proposed site is a intrusion into Green Belt. The lane is very old. It is clearly marked on the Mainwaring Estate Map of 1597 – indeed probably much older, typical of such early origins it twists and turns and in places deep and narrow. It snakes alongside one our historically significant houses – the thatched 'White House'. How can you justify developing in this landscape which is set in history of the town. It would affect its character and setting within the landscape. As is usual with lanes of this antiquity the hedges are of great importance and I'm certain that they support a variety of flora and fauna. Surely development will lead to damage of these ancient hedgerows. The road today is used as a short cut to Mow Cop. With Such extensive development this rat run is going to see a huge increase in traffic. The quality of the road is exceedingly poor: ditches either side in part huge potholes. In order for it to serve a development and a school it would require investment along the length of the road from Tower Hill junction to junction at Wedgewood Lane. In Biddulph Valley Way is much loved and well used resource within the community development would detract from the outlook, peace and tranquillity which are doubtlessly enjoyed by users. The BVW acts as a physical barrier to development. To go beyond it would leave development up the valley side. This would impact on the views of the town from many areas.	- See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage - See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) - See response to PO2044 regarding impact on Landscape - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO4580 regarding highways. - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4651	Mrs H Rutherford				Object	A large increase in traffic would have a serious detrimental effect on this area because access roads to this new estate would spill out onto inadequate roads. Access to it would undoubtedly include cars travelling through Haydon Park estate as well as any new roads built. Underground streams have already affected Dorset Drive increase the danger for all the children who play on the grass by the stream. Akemore Lane is totally inadequate and a road widening/improving these would alter completely the country atmosphere of the area if a school is built it would increase transit through Haydon Park of children, which would also include transit access in Biddulph Valley Way as a start out. Biddulph Valley way is a national cycle route; increased numbers of children crossing it would pose a danger. On this estate we enjoy the wide variety of wildlife – one blessings of this estate that would drastically affect not only by the proposed building estate. Over many years there much undermining under this estate in this area. Many of these have never been mapped. That was witnessed by a caravan sized hole that appeared in Mow Lane. There are other more suitable site and areas of Biddulph where houses can be built and where the impact on people has and will be far less great e.g.: The Meadows land around the old Victoria Colliery etc. both public transport links and access to the main road.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4600	Mrs S Speake				Object	I strongly object to the proposed building on land adjacent to Akemore Lane for the following reasons: There are a few surface lines on this area making any building of houses & a school most unsuitable. This area is very prone to flooding which is already impacted on the houses in Haydon Park where I live. Poor access to the area from existing roads – Akemore Lane is very narrow with no pavements & there is no road in place from the by-pass. National cycle routes is very near to the site which if the building goes ahead will have huge impact on cyclist, walkers and horse riders. There is a lot of wildlife in the area which will be seriously affected if destroyed. A much more suitable site is available on the old Victoria Colliery and land on Childerplay Lane with good access to existing roads.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4589	Mr & Mrs K Shone				Object	We object to any housing allocation on this site due to it being Green Belt Land. Also we understand after looking at the mining reports and speaking to a structural engineer, that there are several mine shafts and more importantly huge open cast coal seams which could have to be excavated before any building work could commence this would totally devastate the Green Belt Lane affecting Wildlife and the Beauty of the area. The effects of noise and dust on the nearby Haydon Park Estate would be horrendous, which could create health issues to the local people many of the elderly.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4591	Mr S Jackson				Object	A habitat for wildlife Akesmore Lane is in Green Belt area. Mine Shafts I was told of a story when i was young man living I Gillow Heath a man fell down a unused mine shaft in Akesmore Lane. There are also underground streams so big risk of flooding. Having lived in Gillow Heath and Biddulph all my life, and watched it grow bigger and bigger we've gone from a small village to a big town so anymore building work should be done outside Biddulph and Gillow Heath areas such as Chatterley Whitfield area.	• See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO216 regarding building in neighbouring authorities instead
PO4672	Mr T Thornton				Object	A natural habit for many varied wildlife Akesmoor Lane is in the countryside where by distribution through the proposed buildings site and consequences there would be impacted upon severely! There are mine shafts. There are 3 streams which are under this area, a high risk under this area of flooding. The lane is not suitable for potential traffic flow a road traffic hazard/accidents! Historic thatched white house – Historically should be preserved. Green Belt land ADDO3 Concerns of considerable traffic, noise and pollution to neighbouring properties. Not in the 2015 site allocations. Time scale of 6 weeks to respond (sometime of which during the school holidays) unlike others that have up to 12 months. Appropriate/viable alternative option – Site allocations, BD076/BD071A/BD076A in this vicinity expansion of BD076A. BD076 Old Telephone exchange preferred employment allocation? Good road access already in place (A527) close to amenities/town centre close to potential retail development. (Biddulph is over developed – the services in place i.e.: water, electrical etc. are inadequate only if BD117/ taken for employment to incorporate housing). Preferred options use or any Brownfield Site/disused sites.	• See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use • BD076/BD071A/BD076A are already included in the plan. • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills)
PO4592	Mrs & Miss J & A Carter/Viccers				Object	Farms & scenery Thatcher's Cottage (white) (listed building) Sites of historic mines Wildlife Footpaths Do not change Green to Brown Why not use the old Victoria Colliery Keep my horses on Akesmore Lane not happy (Amy)	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4595	Mr M Boden				Object	Keep Akesmore Lane as Green Belt save all the wildlife. Lane is too narrow to put footpaths and winding bends there are mine shafts in area and slag heaps. We have a listed building in the area. Need land for livestock to graze in the area. A lot of running water from the natural streams, there is no sewers as I cannot go on using septic tanks. Don't want any houses build on the lane causing excessive traffic. I struggle to get out of my drive as it is.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4596	Mr S Wood				Object	Akesmore Lane is a very narrow for the amount of cars that will be going up and down. We need farm land we get a lot of flooding outside our house now, without building new houses. We have an ancient listed building in Akesmore Lane, the thatched white house. We have mine shafts in the building area.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO386 regarding Mining
PO4599	Mr J hodgkinson				Object	Why must we build on designated Green Belt land which is rich in both beauty and diverse nature and has also a historic building when there is a site crying out to be developed i.e.: the old Victoria Colliery Site.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4673	Mrs G Boden				Object	Akesmoor Lane is a country lane which serves working farms not road to service all the extra traffic which houses and a school would bring. It has too many bends and to narrow. The area is prone to flooding the streets and footpaths, drives would make it prone to more flooding because the water would not be able to soak away. There is a listed building in Akesmoor Lane that needs to be protected from building. We have mine shafts in our front garden which may collapse if too much traffic use it there are mine shafts dotted all around the area.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO386 regarding Mining

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4674	Mrs L Boden				Object	Akesmoor Lane is unsuitable for an increase in volume of traffic due to its narrow composition as well as narrow unsafe bends and? Along as a route, the lane is also unsuitable for expansion due to its length and access, any extra housing developments or school construction would create common blockages due to parked cars during the morning and afternoon as well as the extra volume from the housing, Such an expansion would make the existing road considerably more dangerous for both pedestrians and motorists alike, due to HGVS from equipment such as tracked as well as animal. The road is also prone to heavy and frequent flooding, as well as being located above on old mine network, which could cope with increase in traffic. The local area is also Green Belt and attractive there is no need for development in the area and its peaceful nature. Any development would also put a strain on drainage which is also a significant problem, gushing water and flooding from Biddulph Brook are commonplace during and after rainfall. Aside the environmental problems, building along Akesmoor Lane for would be expensive and difficult due bad access as well as the natural gradient of the land. Any school would be horrendous for the children due to the nature and speed which vehicles travel down Akesmoor Lane. The HGVs travel at high speed considering the very narrow lanes as well as the gradient. Child fatalities would not only be likely but would become common place.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO4567	Mr A Wallis				Object	I strongly object to the building on the Green Belt land when particular need to protect the land west of Biddulph valley way and Akesmoor lane. At this point the track attracts the people because of its aspect and views now cop. It would be a shame to spoil it as it has old mine shafts and has a problem with flooding. Not to mention a grade 2 listed thatched cottage. Other reasons are the immense impact on the area of increased traffic. I think it would be better to make full use of the brown field sites within Biddulph town centre and the old Victoria colliery site to the south of brown leas. So let's all make sure we protect the green belt around Biddulph and the rest of staffs moorlands once it's gone we will never get it back.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4683	Mr C Jukes				Object	High Flood risk, due to there being a under-ground streams, mine shafts historical thatched house green belt.	• See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4682	Mr D Heathcote				Object	ADD03 this land is Green Belt farm land with a very old thatched cottage that should be protected, there are 3 underground streams on this land and it's a high risk off flood area. My family used it in the 1950's to live on Falls Farm in the 1950's (The Falls) why would you build on Green Belt farm land with a high risk of flooding.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO4661	Mr A Parker				Object	Information and map by Railway track entrance alternative locations to be mentioned on form.	Comment noted.
PO4660	Mrs M Ellis				Object	The information needed to build 300 plus houses and school would ideally destroy such a beautiful area that gives some people peace and wildlife – walking along Biddulph Valley Way. The view towards Mow Cop would be destroyed.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4659	Mrs J Woolley				Object	I strongly object to this substantial housing development of green belt land The access in to the Northern end if walking would require pedestrians to use the both sides road to access the town. This is significantly scenic part of the Biddulph Valley Way upside of the valley for all to enjoy this development would cause serious visual impact. There is a substantial land on the open cast mine at Victoria Colliery site that would cause a far less visual impact.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4667	Miss G Collingwood				Object	Outstanding Green Belt area alongside Biddulph Valley Way, this has been used for valuable agriculture and has listed building within its boundaries. The nature of flora and fauna will be lost and will be lost and will become a dumping ground for refuse from the new properties as its happened in lots other parts of Biddulph Valley Way, leading to an area of disuse and misuse as has happened in Stoke on Trent. Other brown field sites and derelict building should be used. There are not enough medical facilities or Dr's to cope the pressure on over used infrastructure will not work.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)
PO4666	Mrs PK Bailey				Object	I object to the building of houses off Akemoor Lane as it is totally unsuitable site.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4694 PO9004	Mr P McGovern Mrs L McFarland				Object	I am writing with reference to the building of houses on Akesmoor Lane site and Newpool Road site near to Cooks Farm. Why build on a Green Belt when there is oh so much Brown Field site to build on? I know school is going to be built but what about the Dr's surgeries. It's difficult enough to get an appointment now, never mind with so many more houses. And what about the traffic on the roads, it's unbelievable that so many houses are (hopefully not) going to be built. Please re-think. Talking about the Brown Field sites, what about the Old Mills on Station Road? You could knock them inside and out and make some homes there killing two birds with one stone: Knocking down the unsightly buildings and at the same time the place look better for those who live opposite and for passers-by too. It would be quite easy to find out who the factories belong to. As for the information that was 'supposedly posted through our letter boxes well what a shambolic (or was it meant to be?) way to post important information tucked inside Farm Foods pamphlets and takeaway menu's). If I need anything from these places, I will find their groceries or meals myself, so don't go through the leaflets. They go straight into the Recycling bag. Please, let's have more transparency. I have put a stamp on the envelope because I want to be sure that it gets to the correct address, otherwise, it may go astray!	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use
PO4665	Mr P McGovern				Object	We live on Mow Lane Gillow Heath many people from around the country walk and bike here also kits of horse riders. The amount of time people stop us gardening and ask us about Gillow Heath. Then they compare us to the settlements in Wales. They go to Biddulph and walk around the town and Gillow Heath off their maps. Traffic problems on Mow Lane will be added to the council do not want to know about this vehicles speed etc. no pavements water pouring down the lanes after storms Green Belt is precious, to birds newts, foxes etc. and if this all goes I have not put my name to it, but you will have.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4664	Mr K Snape				Object	I agree with SMDC, site assessment form site ref no: 1899 Akesmoor Lane not considered suitable for development 26 th June 2015.	Comment noted.
PO4663	Mr K Ward				Object	Information and map by Railway track entrance alternative locations to be mentioned on form.	Comment noted.
PO4662	Mrs M Parkinson				Object	Green Belt keep Biddulph Green protect our nature and wildlife.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4668	Mrs L Jackson				Object	I object I am concerned about the infrastructure of the town, because there will be no opportunities for jobs etc. Also there will be pressure on Ambulance services.	• See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO2044 regarding lack of employment

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4687	Mr Sword				Object	House building numbers do not seem to be for the residents of Biddulph the only other people that will be at Gillow Heath will be commuters, with no affinity to Biddulph. Also it's a dangerous place for people with regards to the road way of Akemoor Lane. It's a Green Belt site that's a good buffer zone for Biddulph residents. So therefore I object to the proposed site for building on.	- See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school - See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO4688	Mr D Oakley				Object	I've walked and lived in Biddulph for a couple of years now and in my time have seen so much wildlife around Akemoor Lane, Foxes, Badger, Rabbits and various birds etc. I think the build of new homes will not only affect wildlife but also cause a lot of traffic issues, noise, crime and the local area of land can't cope with the extra population of people.	- See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times - See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc)
PO4569	Mr D Oakley				Object	To build in this area would greatly disturb lovely natural surroundings to Biddulph which is one of the main reasons many people live here and stay. I regularly walk and exercise around the Akemoor Road area and the variety of wildlife that's seen in my opinions is the greatest reason to not to develop, along with increased traffic to surrounding estates and pressure on facilities e.g. waste/sewage how can such a big development be a good idea?	- See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) - See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity
PO4568	Mr & Mrs G Bradbury				Object	This site in question is very unsuitable Akemoor Lane is only a country and is very narrow. The railway track is very well used by all. There are plenty of Brownfield sites which could be made use off before destroying our countryside and the upheaval of the wildlife.	- See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4571	Mr J Winkle				Object	Green Belt Land – Mature trees all over site very narrow road, 3 streams across site which floods in heavy rain, number of shafts/air shafts on the site. Not suitable for housing.	- See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO386 regarding Mining - See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO4685	Mr F Tomkinson				Object	I object to the proposed development of 150-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley for reasons which are explained on the attached sheets.	Comments noted.
PO4684	Mrs L Tomkinson				Object	I object to the proposed development of 150-250 houses and a possible school near to Harlech Drive, Knypersley for reasons which are explained on the attached sheets.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4681	Mrs R Barlow				Object	We wish object to homes being built on visible open green space off Akemoor Lane, this I totally unacceptable, as this is an area of natural beauty, it seems you want to join us up to Biddulph own down one side and Harriseahead the other why? It's spoiling our town and why changes it from Pennie Way. When Roads are wide, and the Cul De Sac has an entrance in the site already, and the cards, the roads by Akemoor are totally unsuitable and would be unacceptable they are country lane and needs to be kept as so for future generation also the infrastructure cannot take more housing being built, Bovis Estate uplands mill, not selling to social housing. Keep Biddulph Green it's a lovely area that we want to keep not have a blot on the landscape. This is something we only heard about in the last 2 weeks, no letter or leaflets have been delivered, really should send out letters.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4680 regarding using Pennine Way instead • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO2044 regarding impact on Landscape • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use
PO4572	Mrs R Barlow				Object	Gillow Heath is not suitable for housing mine shafts flooding which occurs already Smokies Way, Halls Road Is like a river running down it when it's raining, can't take any more housing. Brown Site at Victoria Site + Childerplay Road Knypersley absolutely perfect for housing good access to roads, Biddulph Valley Way S-o-T and Congleton Manchester Way.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4573	Mr G Vawdrey				Object	This would increase transport, traffic on Halls Road Is excessive, and Akemoor could to cope with the infrastructure traffic, plus a school, the answer is no to this development.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO4574	Mr J Kirkham				Object	Re proposed development of housing & schools on Akemoor Lane map ref no: ADD03, I feel that the access road is not suitable (one way traffic) for any amount of traffic (narrow lane) and also there is 15 th Century Thatched cottage, which would be left derelict by the development if it were to take place. Where the school is proposed, all of the roads surrounding on Haydon Park would be turned into a car park, with cars going to this school crossing the Biddulph Valley Way at the rear of the school playground would be facing the Biddulph Valley Way which isn't suitable as any undesirables could hiding in the bushes, watching the children. The area is of outstanding beauty and the wildlife and habitat would be destroyed and to distribute water course could result in flooding.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO4575	Mrs J McGovern				Object	Traffic problems Mow Lane is a rat run now, this can only add to the problems. Green Belt must be for helping nature, birds, newts, wildlife etc. we have many walkers, bikers and horse riders they love the Greenfields in Gillow Heath if this goes it will be all thanks to you.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4576	Mrs Luckman				Object	Most of the area is agricultural land and contains a listed thatch cottage, The Biddulph Valley way is enjoyed by many and development of this size would spoil the peace of this area and take away many peoples enjoyment. There are plenty of other areas to choose which would have a less impact on residents.	• See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
PO10284	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				Object	We often bike down here, it's home to some beautiful wild life many people use this route just to generally find peace in our very busy lives if this is destroyed by buildings there will be no where else to go.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4689	Mr D Goodwin				Object	I object in writing to the proposal that the area around Akemoor Lane, west of the Biddulph Valley Way should be developed for housing for the following reasons: Access would be very expensive since the Biddulph Valley Way (National Cycle Route 55) would need to be safely negotiated. Akemoor Lane itself would need to be considerably widened to accommodate traffic, destroying ancient oak trees from which the lane gets its name. Drainage would be a real issue since at least 3 streams make their way down the valley. The area is a major English Watershed. The lane itself is becomes a stream itself after a storm and many major attempts to repair Akemoor Lane have only been a short term success. Local flooding, already an issue on the nearby Haydon Park estate, could only get worse. The land that was not developed by open cast in the 60's and is riddled with old bell pits and substantial but unrecorded hidden shafts. Despite illegal tipping by a local land owner the area supports a hugely varied amount of wildlife. General opposition to development. There does appear to be a demand for housing in the area (See the local estate agent figures) Access to and from valley is restricted and would become impossible if 1000 more houses with a potential for 2000 more cars to be placed here. Our sewerage system is already under pressure as it was designed for 17000 homes and now supports 20000. This problem needs urgent attention already but isn't receiving any. Our schools are full. We have a major industry here now. People live here because it's a because of its beauty of the area we don't have elsewhere. I believe existing Greenbelt should be preserved locally and nationally. Childerplay, Landfill, on outskirts of town with access to the A527, Brownfield. Necessary to leave large band of undeveloped land to prevent it from joining up and Stoke on Trent, Land South West of the Victoria Business Park. Previously landscaped after open cast mining. Access to the A527 south of Mill Hayes. Development of the 3 old mills, in the town for housing and alternative accommodation with easier access to current owners on Victoria Business Park. The development should be for sheltered accommodation or similar because of its close proximity to the local shops, medical centres etc. I hope that you will take these points into consideration when making your decisions. Indeed I hope that	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO2044 regarding lack of employment • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills)

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						this letter is read.	
PO4578	Mr & Mrs ML Brookes				Object	I am writing to object to the proposal that has been put forward for school and housing complex. Our objections are that there is an old mine working and tunnels where it has been proposed, plus the wildlife there would truly be affected and truly ruin the walks and cyclist that parents, and I their children have whilst seeing the nature that that is there out there, conserving all of this myself and my wife think that alternative sites are available proven sites, like Victoria Colliery and Childerplay which you look at to consider.	- See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO386 regarding Mining - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay
PO4582	Mrs K Wallis				Object	I strongly object to the propose site of development on Akesmore Lane for the following reasons. If this development goes ahead these houses would be I object because the land it would be built on is Green Belt, which I strongly believe, should be protected & an alternative site should be another reason why I object is because the land is just not suitable for building on, because of flooding & mineshaft problems. Other reasons are an intense impact, on the nearby Biddulph valley way poor access. Increase in traffic & threat to wildlife.	- See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO386 regarding Mining - See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO4584	Mr & Mrs J & G Vickers				Object	We think there are better sites to build on i.e.: The ex-colliery site. The views to Mow Cop from the by-pass are great. Visitor's to Biddulph love it.	- See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
PO4585	Mr C Peach				Object	My main objection to the building by houses and a school off Akesmoor Lane is the volume of traffic it will create, mixed with frequent heavy vehicles; skip hire is a cocktail for accidents.	See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO4583	Mrs J Peach				Object	My main objection to the building of houses and a school off Akesmore Lane is the volume of traffic on the surrounding roads, Wedgewood, Halls; Mow Station Road (double parking) will be a very dangerous. There are Brown Sites, old Mills, Station Road, & Cross Street area that could be tidied up before ruining Green Belt.	- See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) - See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO4975	Mr M Seddon				Object	ADD003 A: Totally unsuitable how the can have been proposed after being rejected in our original allocation by SMDC is unbelievable. B: Green Belt will mean sides B.V.W will have houses and us BVW is a local walkway + cycle route, it will remove the open aspect + the beautiful views to the west. C: Removal of strong boundary to protect ? D: Road access not suitable.	- See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO4904	Mr B Barcoft				Object	i do not support this site.	Comment noted.
PO4899	Mrs K Hallam				Object	i do not support this site.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6716	Mr Jeffrey Killicoat				Object	Object to the proposal of housing and a school on Green Belt land around Akesmore Lane. Green Belt: Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing places for people and for nature long into the future. Neighbourhood plans: Under the Government’s pledges, local people are to have more control over the planning of their neighbourhoods and the protection of Green Belt areas. The development of Neighbourhood Plans is there to give more power to local allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their area and that local people should have the final say on developments in their town. Our objections: According to the “Local Development Framework” document, sustainable development means “A better quality of life for everybody now and in the future”. Why do we need all these extra houses in Biddulph, when there are so many empty properties in the town. These extra houses will put great pressure on the infrastructure - Medical centres, the sewerage system (already overloaded from current residents and the many visitors to Biddulph Grange Gardens, the Country Park, Biddulph Valley Way, Sports facilities, town centre etc..) and the quality of life for residents through increased congestion and pollution. We are astounded that you are considering a plan for houses and a school on the Green Belt land around Akesmore Lane. We have been told that this Green Belt land has been a last minute amendment to the plan, which suggests that you are attempting to deceive people and go against all the principles of Neighbourhood planning. What are the reasons for adding Akesmore Lane to the plan, Biddulph is known as the Garden town of Staffordshire and yet you are willing to deprive local people and visitors of the beautiful countryside on the boundary of the town, which many people enjoy along the Biddulph Valley Way. You are prepared to disturb the wonderful bird/animal life and nature, which is in abundance there. Has an independent ecological survey been undertaken for this site to show the projected effect of water courses, will life (ironically Akesmore Lane has breeding curlews and lapwings (curlews being the bird shown	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO2044 regarding air pollution. • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • Staffordshire County Council, the Education Authority will decide on the most appropriate location for the new school as this depends on where new development takes place.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						on the SMDC logo!!) If you check old Ordinance Survey maps, you will see that this area used to be called “Lapwing fields”. You are prepared to locate housing and a school next to the White Cottage, a very rare example of a Staffordshire thatched dwelling and Grade 1 listed. We have been informed at a recent resident’s meeting that Staffordshire Moorlands District Offices are ignoring objections and ideas from our local Biddulph councillors and riding rough-shod over local people’s wishes, going against all the principles of Neighbourhood plans. We are also very concerned that objections raised to the plan have so far not been uploaded to the relevant website - is this a ruse on your part to discourage people from making their objections, as well as making the website extremely difficult to locate from the main SMDC site? We believe that the Green Belt area proposed is unsuitable for building purposes, due to the many drift mines and the level of flooding over the last few years. Has there been a technical survey of flooding control in this area? There are extensive Brownfield sites in Biddulph and empty properties, which could be used rather than encroaching onto the Green Belt areas of the town. For example, the Victoria Colliery site has had millions spent on it (presumably from residents’ council tax/income tax), so that it could be developed, so surely this would be an ideal option, meeting the government’s commitment to prioritise Brownfield development and the aims of Neighbourhood planning. Another Brownfield site might be the Childerplay area, as well as other sites in the town, such as Whally Street, Singer Street, Cross Street, the ground behind the Leisure Centre (for the school), Caravan storage area, behind Chell’s Yard. If we are not vigilant, we will be allowing our generation to spoil these Green Belt areas for generations to come. It is a terrible plan, badly presented, unscrutinised and rushed through - please stop now and think what you are doing. Above all, please listen to local people and adhere to the principles of Neighbourhood plans and the Government’s commitment to Green Belt areas.	
PO6744	Mr Stephen Dobbs				Object	I have lived in and around biddulph all of my life and in my 51 years I have seen considerable development in the Biddulph valley. I am convinced that the council and developers will not rest until they have completely built on every scrap of greenery in the valley. I absolutely object to any development on green belt land and especially the new proposed site on Akesmore Lane which has recently been added. I believe any such development on green belt land is just the thin end of the wedge and once begun it will pave the way to complete development of all the green belt in the valley. Development of Greenbelt land will reduce the quality of life for everyone who lives in Biddulph apart from the developers, speculators and others looking to profit from the development. I also consider that there is absolutely no need for any further housing in the local area. The councils and governments major	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • See response to PO4580 regarding highways

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						concern should be the development of a stable population size, not uncontrolled and unsustainable and irresponsible population growth and that policies should be adopted which encourage this. If housing is required as a result of councils / government being unable to control population then they should firstly look at bringing second homes and holiday homes back into the mainstream housing market and then as a last resort development of brownfield sites. Biddulph should not be allowed to become one huge estate providing cheap housing for Cheshire and Staffordshire commuters. The charm and uniqueness of the town should not be further denegated and since I am sure there are considerable sums of money to be made by the further development of the town, the developers, speculators, vultures and others seeking to gain should not be allowed to profit and reduce the quality of life for Biddulph residents. In addition to my above objections I must also point out that Biddulph does not have the transport infrastructure to cope with any further development. The roads out of Biddulph via Mow Lane (until recently) and Akesmore Lane have been allowed to lapse into a terrible state of repair with a considerable number of potholes which rendered Akesmore Lane almost impassible in a car. If the council is unable to maintain roads with the current number of vehicles then I dread to think what things would be like with even more vehicles on the roads as a result of building more houses. Also the only road out of Biddulph leading direct to the potteries is often congested especially around Knypersley traffic lights and now increasingly by the site of the business development which has taken place on the Knypersley Vics site. I don't believe any Biddulph residents would welcome further increases in their journey times to get to the potteries or to travel in any other direction out of Biddulph but this is precisely what will happen if there is any further housing development. I trust these comments and objections will be taken on board before the council decides to continue with the proposed plans and I look forward to receiving any comments you may have.	
PO6624	Mr Colin Hall				Object	How many derelict mills and warehouse units exist within your jurisdiction? And how many brownfield sites suitable for development? I would guess there are more than adequate to cover all of your directive for additional housing etc from your lords & masters in Whitehall. It is sloppy and blinkered to not seriously explore this option first. Have you? Greenfield sites are precious and once gone cannot be replaced - especially where wildlife and flora is concerned. Furthermore your slipping in an additional site, ie Akesmore Lane, at short notice - and with only a shortened timespan for objections - is not only sly and cynical, it is a lazy, ugly and inappropriate use of the democratic process.	• See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO1006 regarding poor marketing of consultation / Consultation period too short / Website not easy to use

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6748 PO6749	Mr M Brammer Mrs M Brammer				Object	I object to the use of this area of Green Belt for housing and a school. This area lies outside the natural boundary set by the old railway line / Biddulph Valley Way. There is an uninterrupted view to Congleton Edge that would be spoiled by this area being used for housing. This would be a great loss of amenity. Access to this site is poor along a narrow road. There are mine shafts and culverts in this area with water run off when we have rain. The site also contains what is probably the oldest building in Biddulph. I am concerned that development in this area could have an effect on the Haydon Park Estate as I believe that there could be an increase in water run off which the existing systems could not cope with. If this amendment were to go ahead there would be a danger of housing “creep” to the south towards Knypersley.	- See response to PO4580 regarding highways - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO386 regarding Mining - See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage - See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) - See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO7218	Mr B Roberts				Object	Akesmore Lane – issues: Very narrow country lane especially considering the proposal for 300 homes No footpath No lighting Only one entrance / exit into Biddulph via Wedgwood Lane Poor position for a school	See response to PO4580 regarding highways
PO6599	Ms Catharine Snell				Object	How many derelict mills and warehouse units exist within your jurisdiction? How many existing dwellings are empty or unsold? And how many brownfield sites suitable for development? I would guess there are at least adequate to cover all of your directive for additional housing etc from your lords & masters in Whitehall. It is sloppy and blinkered to not seriously explore this option first. Have you? Why is the Victoria Colliery site not being explored? Greenfield sites are precious and once gone cannot be replaced - especially where farming, wildlife and flora is concerned, never mind objections on other grounds: rural areas being torn up in favour of stereotypical houses and other buildings built on the cheap, and unimaginatively; and years of noise, fumes and disruption in formerly non-urban environments whilst this is underway. Furthermore your slipping in an additional site, ie Akesmore Lane, at short notice - and with only a shortened timespan for objections - is not only sly and cynical, it is a lazy, ugly and inappropriate use of the democratic process. The sewer system is already over capacity and set for more as Biddulph Grange (with its 10,000 annual guests) and surrounding homes are about to be hooked up. What plans do you have for this and other infrastructure? Exactly how do you foresee the residents of almost 1000 homes plus a school use the single track road that is Akesmore Lane. Has this actually been thought through or was a dart thrown at a wall map?	- See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) - Empty properties for sale cannot be counted in future housing need calculations as they could be occupied at any time. - See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay - See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value - See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact - See response to PO87 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times - See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology - See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity - See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage - See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) - See response to PO4580 regarding highways

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6731	Mr & Mrs R Barlow				Object	Wish to OBJECT to the proposed building on greenbelt and an area of outstanding natural beauty which also has an 17th century thatched roof cottage,the land is totally unsuitable for housing having mine shafts and prone to flooding not forgetting the cost to flora and fauna,Biddulph has in excess of 200 or more empty houses.the Boris site of 200 plus houses which they can't sell and selling letting to housing social and others.Biddulph is the garden town of the Staffordshire Moorlands but for how much longer? The infrastructure cannot take more housing stop now not spoil our small town or it will be a city without a town centre.gardens of existing homes are prone to flooding now what will it be like if you build more,look at building on the victoria site and Childerplay road very suitable, or the original site of Pennine Way cul de sacs with the road in situ and wide roads,Biddulph moor is already joined up by way of park lane knypersley.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO4580 regarding highways.
PO6742	Mr & Mrs Wayne Harrison				Object	Object due to: Inadequate road infrastructure, Loss of Green Belt land, Loss of wildlife, fields and hedgerows which under UK Biodiversity Plan Councils have a duty to protect. The Council should use existing brown field sites.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills)
PO6743	Mr J A Turner				Object	Object to loss of beautiful countryside. The majority of residents bought their homes because of the location and do not wish to see houses and a school built on Akesmoor Lane. There are more appropriate brownfield sites elsewhere - why destroy our Green Belt?	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO6747	Mr & Mrs N Booth				Object	Housing density too high. Inadequate infrastructure - roads, drains and services. Spoils the backdrop from Biddulph to Mow Cop. No vote as to which areas of the Green Belt should be released. Impact upon Haydon Park from increased traffic. Area would not support an additional 1000 people and 200 cars.	• The densities put forward are indicative at present. If the site were taken forward and the subject of a planning application the density would be an issue that anyone would have the opportunity to comment on. • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors etc) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding highways.
PO6750	Mr & Mrs G Wilson				Object	Around the town of Biddulph there are numerous brown field sites perfectly suitable for housing developments. As a chartered structural engineer I have vast experience in this type of remedial work and use of brown field sites and modern techniques to make them economically viable to developers. To attack the only remaining areas of green field sites in the Biddulph valley would be detrimental to the future of our children and the people of the town.	• See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills).

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7375	Mr Nigel Yates				Object	Akesmore Lane is a narrow rural lane on the steep western valley side, access to which is along narrow lanes which do not have continuous footpaths, the proposed site was intensively mined during the early 19th C, and many unrecorded shafts and adits exist on the site. The site is criss-crossed by hedgerows containing mature trees and streams draining the valley side - these streams have a history of backing up from the culverts as they pass through to cross the Biddulph Valley Way embankment.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO7250	Mr Gerald Wright				Object	To quote from the on line booklet "The extension to green belt land should only be considered in exceptional cases". The Akesmore lane site ADD03 does not fall into this category as other provision exists on brownfield sites that have already stabilized for building; namely the site of the Victoria colliery site tip which has since been cleared after open cast recovery of coal and re-instated in a manner suitable for building. Although this land is shown as green belt on the plan within the booklet this land has been industrial for over 100 years. If this land was not intended for building why was money spent in stabilizing the land in the first place? Akesmore lane was also once industrial land in that hand dug pits and bell pits were constructed on this land over several hundred years many of which are recorded and many more that will not be. The watershed from the Mow Cop area also collects and is partially absorbed in this area which helps to reduce flow into local streams several of which also emanate or cross this area. Reduction of absorbency with the creation of hard non absorbent areas of construction will also require infrastructure changes in the provision of extra larger culverts to prevent flooding on the existing Haydon Park estate evidence of which can already be found at the top of Mason Drive after alterations to land in area ADD03. In addition to the already mentioned available land on the site of the old pit waste tip there are other brown field sites within Biddulph in the form of dilapidated fustian mills some of which have suffered subsidence due to poor foundations and the old council waste disposal tip which as in Tunstall is also supposed to be suitable for building on. Is this or is this not the case?. Although these sites may not be favored by large builders looking for maximum profit I see it that provisions are available in line with government requirements without the need to encroach on the green belt at this stage and that regardless of cost these sites must be used first before encroaching onto green belt land. Although the Akesmore site is listed as for 60 properties I am lead to believe that in reality this is likely to be in the region of 360, if this is indeed the case then the proposal document is also being dishonest and I would appreciate your comment in this respect. With regards to the proposed provision of a school in Akesmore Lane. The meadows school site I believe to have been found unsuitable for the care home proposed	• If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO4580 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						for the site as the land is considered unsuitable for buildings of more than one storey. If indeed this is the case then as infrastructure in that playing fields etc already exist on this site and its close proximity to Knypersley first school would appear to make it an ideal site to be re used as the area for a new single storey school building similar to the one that burnt down could be reconstructed. It makes no sense whatsoever to destroy these facilities and rebuild them elsewhere in Biddulph especially as this cost would be born by council tax payers and not developers. Would the planning department like to comment on the cost of destroying and re creating these facilities? Finally the waste water treatment plant for Biddulph is at capacity and on occasions is overloaded it also already causes problems to the surrounding area by way of smells. What provision do United Utilities intend to make with regards capacity and control of smells emanating from the plant especially as it would appear that it is intended to build up to this sites boundary and this may inhibit expansion?	
PO7351	Jenny Cryer				Object	I would like to strongly object to the proposed building work off Akesmore Lane in Biddulph. I cannot see at all how the current road networks, sewage systems, doctors and local schools could cope with such an influx of new residents. This needs to be thought through in much more detail and properly provided for before anything on the scale you are proposing could be considered. Akesmore Lane is a lovely country lane and should remain as it is.	• See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors, schools etc)

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9044	Mr and Mrs Siddorn		G Willard	Willard Willard	Object	This site has very significant highway challenges and much uncertainty over land ownership let alone the fact that it provides for a very significant projection (a large finger) eastwards into open countryside and away from the town which is especially damaging in Green Belt terms. It is frankly fantastical that the council have included site AD003 at Akemoor Lane as preferred site when they have not received confirmation from all of the land-owners that they are able and willing to allow the land to be delivered. It is even more perverse given that the site was not allocated in the SHLAA or earlier Site Options consultation in 2015 whereas both BD0138 sites were. Deliverability is key planning considering especially where there is a clear and demonstrable under-supply of housing land. Sites BD0138 can both be delivered. There is significant doubt as to whether AD003 can be. Disagree with the results of the Green Belt Review and consider that they should read as follows: This site breaches the greenway which otherwise provides a strong and very defensible long term Green Belt boundary. It projects a finger of development into the Green Belt which set a precedent for further infill to the South of this site in the future let alone being an unacceptable encroachment into the green Belt in its own right. In addition to this the ground rises to the site and lies adjacent to the greenway making the site highly visible. It is considered that this site makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt and its loss should be avoided. The council are reminded of its own findings in respect of AD003 in the 2015 SHLAA where on the site assessment form the council stated: Site AD003 • A new access would need to be created probably across BVW as Akemoor Lane likely to be too narrow to serve a large number of dwellings. • In floodplain of three watercourses which runs through and under site. Consult EA and SCC. Works on watercourses will need Land Drainage Consent of SCC. Consult EA on surface water (over 1ha). FRA needed. • Intrusion into the Green Belt. Area rural in character. Goes beyond BVW. Access. Likely to be a number of landowners. FRA needed. The council considered the site to be a category C site in 2015 SHLA and it was not identified in the Site options and development boundaries consultation in July of 2015.	• The Council is currently investigating land ownership issues in this area. • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • The relevant SHLAA record, BD140, does not support development of this site giving the reasons of access and landscape character. Since the record was written, it has been established that access would not be an issue which would prevent development of the site. Recent evidence has shown that development of the site would have a high impact on landscape sensitivity. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9008	Mr Denver Johnson				Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices. The infrastructure of our little end of Biddulph has always been strained by the population level, to suggest that the number of houses could be doubled is ludicrous. The main drawbacks to our location have always been increasing traffic on the A527 (it's too crowded now). ADD03 - has had a history of severe flooding. The field is boggy during the Winter and Spring with signs of subsidence. The entire site has been extensively mined and has probably been worked both on the surface and in deep pits going as far back as the Bronze age: in search of copper, iron and latterly coal. Access to this site is so bad that major infrastructure changes would have to be made to the area before it could be opened up.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO445 regarding property values • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage
PO9026	Mr E Shaw				Object	I have considered the plans for the proposed development and I do not wish my land to be considered for the development within the greenbelt and countryside for 330 proposed homes and a school.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9032	The Hart Family		Rob Duncan		Object	This site is identified within the Local Authority's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as: "Not considered suitable for development due to potential access difficulties and the rural character of this area: The Local Authority's Green Belt Review furthermore acknowledges that the land breaches the strong defensible boundary of the Biddulph Valley Way and that the southern extent of the land would be difficult to develop given rising landform and the lack of a clear containing boundary. The site makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt in terms of safeguarding from encroachment and furthermore makes a contribution in terms of preventing sprawl and preserving the setting of the town. I would agree with these conclusions, and for the reasons set out in section 3 above, conclude that my client's sites will have no greater impact on the Green Belt than that which has been identified for this site as a preferred option. A significant concern with the identification of this site as a preferred option, is its viability. The appraisal of the site confirms that from a highway safety perspective a number of enhancements to the local highway network would be required. These include: • Improvements to numerous junctions • Widening of Akesmore Lane along its length • Re-construction of Akesmore Lane • Provision of Street Lighting • Provision of Surface Water Drainage Most significantly the Local Highway Authority also identifies that some third party land may be required to facilitate these works. All of these requirements lead me to conclude that this would not be a financially viable site in the context of its prospective number of dwellings, particularly when you take into account the other developer contributions that would need to be delivered, including the provision of much needed affordable housing, public open space, play areas and the delivery of new school (or alternative education contributions). Aligned with these concerns are matters of unauthorised tipping on the site. I am informed that this site has had a history of illegal tipping of medical waste, which has led to prosecutions by Staffordshire County Council and the Environment Agency. That being the case it raises significant contamination concerns, as for the site to be suitable for residential use, full decontamination would be required. Such decontamination costs would add to the development costs of this site, and in turn further affect the overall viability of the site. On this basis alone the site should not be brought forward for allocation as a housing site. By comparison, my client's sites (BD067a, BD067b and BD067c) already benefit from two existing vehicular access points, do not necessitate such substantive highway improvement works, do not have contamination constraints, and can facilitate the growth of an existing school. It is also a financially viable site having regard to all likely developer contributions. A further objection to the allocation of this site for housing arises from the site ownership situation. As	• See response to PO9044 regarding SHLAA record for site does not support inclusion. • The Council has had viability assessment of the site undertaken and the site is considered marginally viable if the requirement for 33% affordable homes is applied. • See response to PO9044 regarding uncertainty over land ownership • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						acknowledged within the Site Appraisal, three responses are still awaited from registered landowners, and there is also a parcel of land that is unregistered. Its availability to be brought forward for housing is therefore unknown. The site furthermore did not appear as an option within the initial Site Allocations Consultation, and was also given a classification of 'C' within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, with its impact on the rural area and access being identified as significant constraints. Given the above, I would submit that it should not have been identified as a preferred option, as until now the Local Authority has not supported its suitability for development. This site is also known to suffer from flooding. A review of Surface Water Flood Maps from the Environment Agency show that a large portion of the site, particularly the parcel closest to Wedgewood Lane, suffers from significant surface water flooding problems. This will serve to lessen the developable area of the site and contribute to the overall build costs, which are already likely to be significant in light of the highway authority's requirements and other developer contributions. On behalf of my client I would therefore request that the Local Authority abandons this site as a preferred option.	
PO9227	Mr Peter Wilshaw				Object	(Summary) The development of future Housing and any future Solar Farm installation would squeeze the natural life from the valley. It would deplete the Green Belt and detrimentally and dramatically alter the landscape and negatively affect the wellbeing of the people of Biddulph and in particular Gillow Heath. I hope that planners will reconsider the preferred option taking into account the following; Unsuitable road network . These proposed housing sites are situated along the gateways to our countryside and walking tracks e.g. Akesmore Lane, Holy Lane, Mow Lane and Marshgreen Road. These narrow roads already carry an unacceptable level of traffic which when combined with a heavy footfall of walkers with children and animals presents a real danger. This danger is also manifested in the fact that they all lead to crossroads on the A527 at Marshgreen and Smithy Lane which are difficult places to emerge from. If these lanes require widening or other safety upgrade it highly likely the ancient hedgerows will be destroyed and therefore the characteristics of that landscape lost for ever. Situating parking places at various spots on the west side of the valley at medium to high elevation would enable access to many walking tracks and elevate the mix of cars and people on the narrow lanes. Diminishing of the Green Belt in the short and long term. The release of Green Belt land, according to the NPPF, should only take place in "exceptional circumstances". There is not statement to say what those circumstances are and why land can be released in Biddulph and other places but, not in Leek? Site ADD03. Is it 300 or 70 houses plus a school? Unsuitable area	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO2044 regarding impact on Landscape • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						adjacent to the Grade II listed White house (the oldest house and tourist attraction in Biddulph). Cumulative and Visual damage to the historic and characteristics of the north Staffordshire uplands area of Gillow Heath . Biddulph valley is also a gateway to the moorlands and The Peak District National Park. It was granted the title of “The Garden Town of Staffordshire” and over twenty years of volunteer effort to showcase the town, Biddulph in Bloom Charity has won many RHS Heart of England in Bloom awards and in 2015 came second in the National Large Town category. I feel that the location and magnitude of these developments will adversely affect the confidence, so hard fought for, in the effort to improve our town and increase tourism. In many respects this plan does not meet the Core Strategy of SMDC and SCC in meeting their own obligations stated in the Historical Environment Assessment Report which is to protect and retain the character of the landscape and follow and develop many of the recommendation therein. There is a finite limit to the availability of land on which to build houses and the limit to where the wellbeing and recreation of the population is detrimentally affected. The County’s Historic Environment Assessment demonstrates that this area has historic value in terms of heritage and historic landscape character.	
PO9605	Mrs Alys Gregory				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Site is in an area of natural beauty; Impact on local wildlife; Remote and inaccessible location - narrow lane with deep ditches in places, traffic would be horrendous; No industry to sustain development; Loss of Green Belt; Impact on White House Listed Building; Impact on Biddulph Valley Way; Old mining workings in the area; Costly to convert access road across BVW; A number of vital footpaths cross the site; Dangerous access for school children; A farm in the area regularly burns rubbish which would affect schoolchildren; and Heavy farm vehicles use the road and leave mud and debris which is a potential danger.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO2044 regarding lack of employment • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO274 regarding loss of public footpath(s) • See response to PO274 regarding problem of pollution - burning rubbish from local farm

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9642	Mr P Durnall				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of the site for the following reasons: Lack of demand for new housing in Biddulph; Akemoor Lane is unsuitable for heavy traffic and would cost millions of pounds to upgrade, the junction with Wedgewood Lane would require massive investment to be made adequate for additional traffic, Tower Hill Road junction is also inadequate (see photos attached); New school would only serve one level of 3 tier system; Lack of pavements presents a danger to pedestrians including children; Mining legacy of area; Whole area is subject to flooding - during heavy rainfall rust coloured water pours out of the old mines on to the lane; All of water then has to find its way to Biddulph Brook via culverts and ditches in and around Smokies Way and Haydon Park estates with blockages occurring (see attached photos); Loss of Green Belt; Development on west side of Biddulph Valley Way sets a precedent; Loss of agricultural land; and Impact on wildlife.	• See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO775 regarding lack of infrastructure (doctors, schools etc) • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO9612	Mrs J Brown				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Loss of Green Belt; Sets a precedent for development on the west side of the Biddulph Valley Way, altering the town boundary; Site was a late addition as it was not included in previous consultation; A number of water courses run across the site which already cause problems on Haydon Park and various points down to the sewage works during periods of heavy rainfall - 300 extra houses would cause further problems; Concerns about pedestrian access to town centre and leisure facilities due to lack of footpaths on the lanes around the site; The school would be likely to be built after the houses so in the meantime children would have to travel to Oxhey First School and Woodhouse Middle School, the Pennine Way estate includes a lot of older people who do not have young children and this trend is likely to continue and should create spare capacity at these schools particularly by 2030; and Consider that the Pennine Way area would be more suitable for development than this location - has existing schools, better pedestrian access to facilities, any issues with surface water flooding could be resolved more easily.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO10279 regarding why site was not included at site options stage • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO1132 regarding water treatment works over capacity • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4680 regarding using Pennine Way instead

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9638	Miss D Boden				Object	(Summary) Object to development of site for the following reasons: Impact on wildlife including loss of trees and hedgerows; 3 culverts run under Smokies Way - have a lot of flooding from Akemoor Lane already, more development would make the situation worse; Mining legacy on site; Loss of public footpaths; Impact on Biddulph Valley Way; Akemoor Lane is very narrow and a lot of large agricultural vehicles use it - highway safety issue; Impact on White House Listed Building; Loss of agricultural land; Loss of Green Belt; Enough brown field areas exist in Biddulph e.g. old Victoria Colliery; and School would not be feasible due to existing highway network.	• See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO2044 regarding impact on Landscape • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO274 regarding loss of public footpath(s) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4580 regarding highways • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4595 regarding agricultural land value • See response to PO4586 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt
PO9637	Mr D Jones				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Mining history; Flood risk area; Heavy traffic at peak times and dangerous access via Mow Lane, Wedgewood Lane and Akemoor Lane and heavy agricultural traffic in season; Impact on the White House (Listed building); Impact on Biddulph Valley Way; Wharf Road access would be costly to create; Impact on wildlife; Loss of footpaths; Access and parking would be dangerous for schoolchildren; and Local farm burns rubbish causing air pollution.	• See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • The Council has had viability assessment of the site undertaken and the site is considered marginally viable if the requirement for 33% affordable homes is applied. • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO274 regarding loss of public footpath(s) • See response to PO274 regarding problem of pollution - burning rubbish from local farm
PO10243	Mr R Hart				Object	This should not be considered as it goes deep into the green belt..this land is a visual open space towards mow cop [viewed from] biddulph valley way. Area is abundant with wildlife. Should be left alone for people to enjoy.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology
PO9963	Mr C Lunt				Object	The SMDC planners had previously ruled this site out, are the planning team now saying that the BVW is not a strong boundary? It's views from the BVW that give Biddulph it's identity, build all over those fields adjacent to it and that identity will be lost. Where will it end if this boundary is crossed?	• See response to PO9044 regarding SHLAA record for site does not support inclusion • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9973	Ms Carol Ann Nixon				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Destruction of wildlife; Destruction of ecology - protected hedgerows and trees and wild flowers - negative impact on birds; Use of the area for recreational purposes (e.g. cycling, running, walking) would be more dangerous; Junction via Mow Lane, Wedgewood Lane, Akemoor Lane and Halls Road is already very dangerous and potential conflict with farm traffic would be a safety issue; School in this location would cause highway safety issues; Costly to create access over Biddulph Valley Way; Loss of footpaths; Unacceptable encroachment into Green Belt; Loss of open space and visual amenity along Biddulph Valley Way; Loss of setting for White House listed building and views to Mow Cop Castle; Regular flooding occurs along Akemoor Lane; Presence of mine shafts; Access to nature is better for mental and physical wellbeing of people; and one farm in the area regularly burns rubbish causing air pollution.	• See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO9637 regarding viability. • See response to PO274 regarding loss of public footpath(s) • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO455 regarding impact on Listed White House / Reduce size of site (southern part only) • See response to PO386 regarding Mining • See response to PO386 regarding Flooding – surface water drainage • See response to PO274 regarding problem of pollution - burning rubbish from local farm • Pollution – farm burns rubbish
PO10256	Mrs Shirley Foster				Object	The proposed plans for the site off Akemoor Lane in Biddulph will completely decimate the local flora and fauna. The proposed site is home to many species of plants and wildlife including bats, bats are a protected species and it is against the law to disturb and resting or breeding sites, the below has been taken directly off the government website: What you must not do You're breaking the law if you do certain things including: deliberately capture, injure or kill bats damage or destroy a breeding or resting place obstruct access to their resting or sheltering places possess, sell, control or transport live or dead bats, or parts of them intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it's in a structure or place of shelter or protection Either or both of the following could happen if you're found guilty of any offences: you could be sent to prison for up to 6 months you could get an unlimited fine Activities that can harm bats Activities that can affect bats include: renovating, converting or demolishing a building cutting down or removing branches from a mature tree repairing or replacing a roof repointing brickwork insulating or converting a loft installing lighting in a roost, or outside if it lights up the entrance to the roost removing 'commuting habitats' like hedgerows, watercourses or woodland changing or removing bats' foraging areas using insecticides or treating timber The conservative manifesto also clearly states the following: on page 51 ensure local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt. Also Page 52 it again clearly states: We will protect the Green Belt We have safeguarded national Green Belt protection and increased protection of important green spaces We have abolished the Labour Government's top-down Regional Strategies which sought to delete the Green Belt in and around 30 towns and cities and introduced a new Local Green Space planning designation which allows councils	• See response to PO4581 regarding Ecology • See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						and neighbourhood plans to give added protection to valuable local green spaces	
PO9777	Mr M Barlow				Object	There is not the need for so many houses. We have hundreds of empty houses already built and cannot sell them. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty please don't spoil it. It is not suitable for building. It is not low lying, it is steep - try walking up the lane. As for closeness to the town - most people have cars. It will not reduce people shopping outside the area as Biddulph town has no real shops, most closed when Sainsburys took over the town and it would make Halls Road playing fields more dangerous to go to due to increased traffic. Most parents take children to school by car even when they live close to the school. The bypass is not that busy, after rush hour you can cross over without pressing the lights and people from both sides of Biddulph would use the school.	• See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school • Existing houses which are currently empty do not count towards future supply as they could be occupied at any time. • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
PO306 PO543	Mr Russell Picken Mrs C Picken				Object	This site should be extended and possibly moved slightly southwards into sites BD116 and the area of site BD140, adjacent to sites BD071 and BD071a for the following reasons: This development would start to rebalance Biddulph in the right direction, i.e. it would start to move the town centre back towards the centre of the town. A proper, suitably sized road system / infrastructure for the new housing estate could be built, capable of accepting future extension of the site. It should be built with direct access to the bypass. There is already an access road into site BD140, which passes the boundary of BD116 at its north-west corner. It originally formed part of Wharf Road, but was bisected by the construction of the bypass. Although currently in poor condition, it could be upgraded and has the benefit of already having access across the BVW, in the same manner as that found in Marsh Green Road. New properties in this area would be much closer to the town centre. This could encourage people to walk, particularly for limited shopping. This then has the advantages of being more environmentally friendly and also reducing the traffic in the town and parking requirements. New housing developments in this would have much less of a visual impact on the area and would not constitute 'urban creep'. A strip of visual open space could be included between the development and the BVW. This would make the new housing development more appealing visually, both from within the development itself and when viewed from the BVW. This could also act as a wildlife corridor. These sites are well placed to take advantage of some of the new services and facilities, i.e. the new Primary Health Care Centre, which is within easy walking distance, from these sites, for most people. These areas could be developed without dominating the outlook from existing properties. Also they would not overlook the said existing properties. The development of these sites would not add to	Comments noted. This area is being considered by the Council as a possible housing site with linkages to BD071 and BD071a as you suggest.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						existing property flooding issues. The BVW would provide a relative safe and easy access to the playing fields at Gillow Heath, either by walking, or by cycling. These sites could comply with items 1, 2 and 4 of the 'T1 – Development and Sustainable Transport' section of the 'Preferred Transport Policies' from the 'Core Strategy Draft Preferred Options' document, as shown in Appendix A.	
PO1021	Mr Peter Barnett				Object	This area is green belt ADD03, and as such should not be included for proposed housing and school development. The infrastructure is not suitable to carry the additional heavy loads of building materials which would be required to develop this site. What damage to our houses would be inflicted if millions of tons of building materials were hauled up Station Road and Halls Road to give access to Akemoor Lane daily, which in self is too narrow. Not only that presumably if a school is built there would be inadequate parking for the parents as history shows that parents drive their children to school in many cases and this would therefore encroach on to available road space on these streets causing additional congestion. It would also make the cycle/walkway, fenced on both sides, and appearing like walking up an entry, thus defeating the object of a country walk.	• See response to PO20 regarding loss of Green Belt • See response to PO4580 regarding highways. • See response to PO4580 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact
	Petition with 361 signatures				Object / Support	We the undersigned residents of the North of Biddulph wish to register our support for a revised version of ADD03, whereby the narrow north end abutting gardens is excluded, instead starting at the beginning of the visual open space. The site could then extend further to the south allowing for greater opportunities for access to the bypass • Starting south of where the open space begins • Leaving a screening barrier consisting of the existing visual open space and the hedged discussed rail track • Maintaining the nature corridor between the existing and new developments • Access could be onto the bypass and then to the Town Centre, and with potential funding from the development • Including the planned Primary School allows access on foot, reducing vehicle use and pollution • Opening up the possibility to extend this at a later date, including with easy access to Kidsgrove and beyond, and the motorways.	Comments noted. Land in this area is being considered by the Council as a possible housing site with linkages to BD071 and BD071a and the bypass as you suggest.
PO541 PO595	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey				Support	While we do not agree that Biddulph needs this number of new properties, we understand that unless Biddulph takes control through the Neighbourhood Plan we risk developments 'running wild' as has happened elsewhere. Filling out to the West gives the opportunity to achieve a better balance to the town.	Comments noted. See response to PO4586 regarding need for housing and school.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO724	Mr Philip Beech				Support	This area of Biddulph is ideally situated for development of housing and the proposed new school. Utilisation of this land will allow for a 'future proofing' approach to development, as the land is not hemmed in by other developments or roads. I wholly support the use of ADD03, as it and adjacent land will meet the future development needs for many years to come.	Comments noted.
PO4858	Mr Chris Millington				Support	Support Akemoor Lane as can access onto now sites & bypass – has close proximity to the centre for walking retains a natural barrier and eco corridor for wildlife.	Comments noted.
PO6712	Dr Emma Stanmore				Support	I am in support of the preferred site of Akemoor Lane as opposed to the other considered sites further north bordering Wedgwood Lane, Mow Lane and Well Lane, as these sites are noted as having considerable value to the special character of the area in the Green Belt consultation. Any development to the North of Biddulph closes the gap between the town and Congleton, particularly Congleton Edge, which should be avoided to preserve the distinct identity of each district. The quality of landscape in the Biddulph Valley to the North of the town is far greater than the West (i.e. Akemoor Lane), due to its unspoilt nature, and should therefore be protected against major development. It should also be noted that several subsidence issues have occurred in the field off Wedgwood Lane, due to redundant mine workings collapsing. The national coal board were involved in rectifying these problems by excavating and backfilling the areas of concern.	Comments noted.
PO6719	Mr Michael Stanmore				Support	I am in support of the preferred site of Akemoor Lane as opposed to the other considered sites further north bordering Wedgwood Lane, Mow Lane and Well Lane, as these sites are noted as having considerable value to the special character of the area in the Green Belt consultation. Any development to the North of Biddulph closes the gap between the town and Congleton, particularly Congleton Edge, which should be avoided to preserve the distinct identity of each district. The quality of landscape in the Biddulph Valley to the North of the town is far greater than the West (i.e. Akemoor Lane), due to its unspoilt nature, and should therefore be protected against major development. It should also be noted that several subsidence issues have occurred in the field off Wedgwood Lane, due to redundant mine workings collapsing.	Comments noted.
PO7585	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements. This site offers an opportunity to access greater CIL contributions.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10228	Mr Graeme Court				Support	Suggest this as an alternative site. I recognise this is a controversial site but it does have its merits, provided the land bordering Akesmore Lane itself is not used. This large site could be opened up by extending and improving the partially built access road, off the Inner Ring Road, to the south of the BT phone exchange.	Comments noted.
PO10053	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	This is a low lying area and would be less visually intrusive from the Biddulph Moor and Mow Cop ridge lines. It has good access to the town centre.	Comments noted.
PO9792	Mr Eric Biddle				Support	At present Biddulph is not a balanced town. To put this right areas to the west and south must be developed. Support development south of ADD03.	Comments noted.
PO10205	Mr Stan Charlesworth				Support	(Summary) Support for development in this location for the following reasons: new dwellings would be close to the town centre and services and facilities make Biddulph more compact support for a new Primary School within the site.	Comments noted.
PO10286	Mr D Heath				Support	The Akesmore Lane site is more accessible for the town centre and the new school these would be more acceptable. There are already several more acceptable routes from there, Marsh Green Lane, Mow Lane, Station Road, Wharf Road and New Pool Road. It would also be easier to walk to the town centre and the school so saving on car parking and problems and pollution.	Comments noted.
PO10024	Mr & Mrs D Cartwright				Support	(Summary). Seems the best area to complete the town (more symmetrical) low lying land with natural screening and would retain open aspect of land near to the Halls Road sports ground walking to work will be a possibility from this area walking distance to the town which will help regeneration and access facilities and services not too close to other existing houses	Comments noted.
PO10175 PO10066 PO10164 PO9994 PO10111 PO10042 PO10152 PO9864 PO9682 PO9662	Mr Robert Chambers G B Ford Mr N Clowes Mr D Cliffe Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mrs B Rowland Mr Gayle Mrs P Hancock Mr and Mrs A D Lawton				Support	Support.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD03 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7700 PO7740 PO7145 PO8316 PO8367 PO5016 PO6226 PO6330	Mr J Shelly Mrs E Griffiths Mr A Atkinson Mr A Hague Mr and Mrs W Summerscales Mr R Milner Mrs P Newton Ms S Wilson						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1316	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary) With regards to site references ADD04, BD069 and BD117, these sites appear likely to discharge to that area served by Severn Trent for the provision of wastewater services. It would be useful to confirm with the respective landowners the likely point of discharge to the wastewater network from these sites so that we can confirm the receiving wastewater infrastructure and therefore better understand the impact.	Points of discharge to the wastewater network are a detail which can be confirmed at a later stage in the process once the sites have been allocated in the Local Plan and detailed development schemes become available at the planning application stage.
PO2593	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2888	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	ADD04 appears to partially affect a Local Geological / Geomorphological Sites (LoGS) which covers a geomorphological feature. Layout and design should avoid impacts on this feature in consultation with GeoConservation Staffordshire.	Comments noted. Reference to the geological site will be included in the relevant site policy if this site is selected for development in the Local Plan.
PO2915	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Site ADD04 is likely to require junction and access improvements.	Comments noted. These can be incorporated into a planning application should this site be selected to take forward.
PO4619	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			General comment	ADD04 - Further investigation is required for this site. It needs to be put out for consultation and comments and see what is the response. It also needs to be properly defined on the map. How do you propose accessing this site? Recommendation TBD	Comments noted. Consultation has now taken place on this site. Access is proposed from Harlech Drive.
PO1137 PO6630 PO6699 PO6740 PO7490	<u>Petition with 114 signatures</u> Plus: Mr & Mrs G & B Dawson Mr Eric Cox Mr Glenn Walker Mrs Lisa Barrow Mr L Wright				Object	As a local resident I call on SMDC to remove area ADD04 (Harlech Drive, Knypersley) from the 2012-2031 Local Plan Preferred Option Sites. This community is opposed to Green Belt development and we believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council needs to be considered the following: <u>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</u> 1. NPPF (Paragraph 83) states that "once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". The council's plans do not justify "exceptional circumstances" that would require them to build on unspoiled green field land to meet their current housing targets.	In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study concludes that the overall impact of this area on Green Belt purposes is moderate. It states that: "This is a significant area of land which cannot be readily subdivided because of an

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7214 PO7242 PO7272 PO7275 PO7292 PO7302 PO7304 PO7491 PO4219 PO4041	Ms Angela Hancock Mr Lee Platt Mr TANVEER YASIN Mr MOHAMMED YASIN Mr Nargus Yasin Naveed Rashid Mrs Michelle Walker Mrs Caroline Wright Mr R Butler Mrs J Picken					Town centre sites together with carefully selected reclaimed land sites elsewhere could be developed to meet this need. 2. NPPF (paragraph 111) states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field sites. However, the preferred option plans as recommended at Stage 2 consultation offer up green field sites in preference to other brown field site developments already proposed. 3. NPPF (paragraph 156-157) states that infrastructure must come first, yet outline plans to provide new infrastructure are not being prepared in advance. Currently there are no plans for historic conservation of the Knypersley Hall estate. There is no green infrastructure plan and no plans to develop sport and recreation of the south east of Knypersley. 4. NPPF (paragraph 83 & 85). The proposed new Green Belt boundaries for site ADD04 are illogical because they follow arbitrary field boundaries. There are no physical boundaries to prevent unchecked incursion into surrounding countryside making this location extremely vulnerable to future encroachment. The proposed boundary does not meet NPPF criteria stating that a Green Belt change must have long term permanence capable of enduring for 30-50 years. <u>SMDC Green Belt Review Study</u> 5. Development of 150-250 houses on this site potentially is merely the first step in a wider plan to develop a new school and up to 1,070 houses within Green Belt Review Area N17. This represents creeping erosion of Biddulph's open countryside. Urbanisation on this scale within the Green Belt is unacceptable and would have a large negative impact on existing countryside in Biddulph South, an area of outstanding natural beauty. 6. The Green Belt Review recommends that (other than BD117, BD069 & BD131b) there should be no release of Green Belt in area N17 within the plan period 2012-2031. It then states that, if desired, the council could reconsider this area for release in a future Local Plan. Thus, the inclusion of ADD04 as a Preferred Site at this time is appropriate and is contrary to the review study's recommendations. <u>Impact on highway traffic and road safety</u> 7. Site access would be via a narrow private road leading to a farm track. The entrance road may need to be widened making this site impossible or difficult to develop without complex land acquisition. 8. The area around Harlech Drive and Conway Road has three schools in the immediate vicinity already and is affected by high traffic flow at peak times. 180-280 new houses (ADD04 & BD069 combined) would cause an estimated increase in traffic flow of up to 550 extra cars causing significant extra traffic problems. 9. This site is not a suitable location for the proposed new school. Knypersley already has a pre-school nursery and a primary school nearby.	absence of clear internal boundaries. It is well contained physically and visually by Mill Hayes Road and whilst making a contribution to Green Belt purposes in respect of separation and setting, comprehensive masterplanning (which would retain existing open space and sports pitches) could yield a development which would help to reinforce wider Green belt function. It recommends considering site ADD04 for release from the Green Belt. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a remnant of the parkland, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts'. It should be noted that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore, the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Entrance to the site is via a quiet residential district mainly occupied by elderly people. Quality of life will be harmed and there could be significant disruption to the existing community. <u>Effect on the landscape</u> 10. Open countryside, public footpaths, historic parkland in the vicinity of Knypersley Hall (Grade II* listed), the fishing pool, the cricket pavilion, and fields adjacent to Knypersley Cricket Ground are all an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. (The cricket ground itself was donated to the community by the Bateman family). Open countryside forms an integral part of the surrounding natural landscape and, if developed upon, connection between the Knypersley community and the natural environment would be lost forever. 11. Development of this site would cause significant harm to Knypersley's sense of place and to its unique semi-rural village identity centred upon Newpool Meadows, the cricket ground and pavilion, and its magnificent landscape setting. This new housing would significantly harm the local landscape and potentially could damage the separate "village community" identity that Knypersley enjoys at present. NPPF policy states that merging of neighbouring communities is to be prevented. 12. Footpath 11, which runs from Harlech Drive to Mill Hayes Lane, provides access to beautiful open countryside for the town as a whole. This path provides important public access to open space overlooking the cricket ground and to a large area of open countryside beyond. This footpath interconnects Biddulph with Greenway Bank Country Park to the south making this a strategically important area requiring special Green Belt protection (not an area of derelict land requiring urban infill). The proposed development would cause significant harm to our green infrastructure objectives. Biddulph's footpaths should pass through open countryside, not through an urban landscape. <u>Historic conservation of the natural environment</u> 13. For many years the Green Belt around Biddulph has made a significant contribution towards protecting its major historic assets including Knypersley Hall and nearby historic parkland. The council's 2010 Historic Environment Character Assessment Report identifies numerous heritage assets near to the hall which connect the de Knypersley, Bowyer, Bateman, and Heath families to this area and which form an important part of understanding both the history of Biddulph Grange Gardens and of Biddulph as a whole. The report recommends that the remnants of its historic parkland should be conserved and states that "development is not deemed to be appropriate within this zone". The proposed ADD04 development is incompatible with this objective and therefore makes the site completely unsuitable for high density housing. 14. Further south lies an area of ancient valley farmland, the last remaining such farmland in the Biddulph Valley. The conservation of this area is also recognised as important and this farmland, together with its	overall suitability of the site for development. - The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan. - The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. - From the Highway Authority's point of view, a Transport Assessment would be required at the planning application stage. Creation of an access directly onto the A527 is preferred though a limited amount of development could be accommodated using an access onto Harlech Drive. No concerns were raised by the Highway Authority about any localised traffic problems as a result of development here. - Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. - If this area is selected for development, the scheme would be designed to take into account its setting and heritage impact as well as any infrastructure and / or site constraints. A planning application would be required before any development could take place and this would be open for anyone to comment on. - Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						historic field boundaries, should be preserved for the long term future benefit of our town's heritage. 15. Nearby Knypersley Fishing Pool is already designated as a protected nature conservation site. Existing hedgerows within the proposed ADD04 site boundary host a large array of wildlife that would perish as a result of this development. Bats are known to live nearby. Therefore this site, if developed for housing, could have a serious detrimental impact on nature conservation in this locality.	would be considered at the planning application stage. - Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'Site comprises land to the west and south of Knypersley Hall, including a large, open field which slopes down from the hall in the north of the site, and more undulating land in the south of the site containing a pond and scattered trees. The site is separated from the settlement edge by Knypersley Hall and agricultural land to the north. Development of the site could adversely affect the existing settlement form, particularly in the southern extent of the site. The northern section of the site has high visual prominence, particularly when viewed from Tunstall Road. Site is of high landscape sensitivity. Please note that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore, the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development. - Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD04 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended]. - Wherever possible hedgerows would be incorporated into any future development scheme.
PO4669	Mrs C Williams				Object	ADD04 (BD131) Land off Mill Hayes Road. Land drafted for school has public foot path through, it which part of the 'Staffordshire Way' a path regularly used by open space. Land used by local residents and ramblers. This should remain and be kept as green space. Land drafted for school has public large storm water pipe and culvert through it the plans do not show how the council propose to develop around it. Development of the former parkland of Knypersley Hall, Grade 11 listed would be better with green open space left around the Hall. Development on the former parkland of Knypersley Hall, beautiful old trees in this area need to be protected as they are a major part of Knypersley Hall's character and history. Unacceptable increase in the volume of the traffic using Harlech Drive, with added parking and congestion close to Knypersley traffic lights. Increased volume of road surface water runoff, going towards an already over loaded system.	- See response to Petition regarding loss of public footpath - See response to Petition regarding site design / visual impact / buffer around Knypersley Hall - See response to Petition regarding highways. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1339	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Site ADD04 has not been covered by the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys.	Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD04 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended].
PO1359	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			Object	Map 4.5 Biddulph - ADD04 - green belt release for housing with a possible school - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation on the Grade II* listed building Knypesley Hall, its associated Grade II listed buildings and the setting of all, individually and cumulatively, has been considered. Further information on this is required.	Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a remnant of the parkland, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts'. It should be noted that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore, the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development.
PO1134	Mr Jason Tilsley				Object	I am writing to object due to concern about loss of green areas – consider that once this trend starts there is no going back. Our children will not be able to enjoy the quite locations and open spaces. Residents like myself who have chosen to live here enjoy the quite location. If plans go further then to develop we will see a increase of small roads trying to cope with a minimum of 150 vehicle increase with a realistic volume of 300 vehicles. The result would be noise, air pollution, gridlocked roads at peak hours, safety reduced for our children and property prices falling once we join the mass volume with a less attraction to the location. We are proud to be a part of Biddulph owing to its independence and supported feel to which the local authorities have always put the people and how plans affect the local looks and environment with great thought. For a small rural town we have great volume and estates we will reduce our attraction with a greater volume. Think for the future not a quick fix. This is also your home, take care.	- See response to Petition regarding highways. - See response to Petition regarding site design / visual impact / buffer around Knypesley Hall - See response to Petition regarding residential amenity e.g. noise from school, parking problems - If the district council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. - Property values are not considered material in planning law.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1141	Ava Heath				Object	I am very concerned about your proposals for the above and submit my objections as follows:- Use of Green Belt and taking away dedicated open spaces which will affect all the wildlife that live in these areas. Additional Traffic flow/volume of traffic that this will create in this area. Conway Road is currently used as a short cut to avoid Park Lane lights by general traffic passing through. Vehicle Access via an already well used road. Sewerage/Drainage Maintenance of roads and pavements is not to an acceptable standard now (the litter and chewing gum on pavements is disgusting). Conway Road is heavily used at school start/end times with parents parking their cars while waiting at pick-up/drop off places for their children – Will a survey be carried out to assess the problems that currently exist before considering your proposals which will only exacerbate the problems? Parking permits would be helpful in our cul de sac to put a stop to this. It should be a stipulation that schools should provide sufficient parking areas so as to avoid parents 'on-street parking' which degrades the road system in the area and causes a danger for pedestrians and other passing traffic.	• See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances • See response to Petition regarding site design / visual impact / buffer around Knypersley Hall • See response to Petition regarding Ecology • See response to Petition regarding highways. • See response to PO4669 regarding Drainage / Sewage • See response to Petition regarding residential amenity e.g. noise from school, parking problems
PO1150	Carol Mountford				Object	Location of proposed school - access/traffic. There are already three schools close to Conway Road, and these are the High School at the top of Conway Road, James Bateman Junior High in Park Lane and Knypersley First School on Tunstall Road. They all generate traffic for Conway Road - used to access schools, use to park, drop off and pick up children from each school, including driving round and round while waiting for children to come out of school. Traffic congestion and parking would be even greater. Also if we want to encourage more people to walk to school then schools need to be located within walking distance of the main catchment area. 150 houses is a massive development - increase in traffic for Conway Road and out onto Tunstall Road, (each home is likely to have at least two cars), impact on land drainage - some houses already have problems with standing water in their back gardens, lack of investment in infrastructure to support new developments - particularly roads. Totally changes a quiet residential area, with good green space into just another estate with as many as houses as possible crammed in. 30 houses on former garden site - too many for the site, impact on traffic. Consider a more imaginative and innovative development in keeping with the area and the wonderful restoration work done on Knypersley Hall. Consider either a well set out care home with garden space around it and or 10 high quality homes set in green space - where do the plans for Knypersley have any upmarket, spacious development - can we not make this space more attractive than just cramming in more houses?	• See response to Petition regarding highways. • See response to Petition regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO4669 regarding Drainage / Sewage. • See response to Petition regarding residential amenity e.g. noise from school, parking problems. • See response to Petition regarding Heritage impact
PO4974	Mr M Seddon				Object	ADD04 a: Green Belt b: building in front of a historic building c: the roads are not suitable	• See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances • See response to Petition regarding Heritage impact • See response to Petition regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6727	Mr Kevin Reynolds				Object	Just to give my view and concerns on any developments on the former Garden Centre site, the field adjacent to Knypersley Hall and to the south of Conway Road I myself and many others in the area are opposed to future housing in view of taking away the countryside in this area of which will effect wildlife and the natural habitat of many animals and birds. Also the effect of increased traffic in the area regarding Conway Road and Harlech Drive of which Conway Road has now become a rat run for people trying to avoid the traffic lights at Knypersley corner and the extra dangers that will occur for the pupils that attend Biddulph High School that will obviously increase.	• See response to Petition regarding site design / visual impact / buffer around Knypersley Hall • See response to Petition regarding Ecology • See response to Petition regarding highways.
PO7213	Mr & Mrs B Lowndes				Object	We object to the proposals to permit possible development of this site (ADD04), around Harlech Drive/Conway Road, with housing and, potentially, a school. 1) Physical Geography of Site Parts of the site are simply unsuitable for housing development. They may be appropriate for a cheese-rolling contest should Staffordshire want to set up in competition with Cooper's Hill in Gloucestershire. The residents could need a ski-lift to reach the top of the site and 4wheel drive vehicles for driving home. Seriously, not good for a housing estate. 2) Traffic Problems There is no suitable vehicular access to the site short of driving across the cricket pitch and creating some rough for the spinners to exploit – a silly idea. Harlech Drive and the track leading off are totally inadequate to cope with the extra volume generated by building work and, then, residential and school traffic. The increase would make our roads less safe. 3) Green Belt Development Our Victorian forefathers, as cities, including the Potteries, expanded rapidly following the Industrial Revolution, well understood the importance of open spaces to our health and well-being. Hence the legacy of parks, gardens and recreational areas. This continued in the post-war rebuilding era, when the Town & Country Planning Act 1947 allowed the creation of Green Belt areas, a work already commenced by Greater London in the 1930s. Green Belt land never was, and still is not, meant to be built on, such development would not be demonstrating good stewardship.. Indeed, it is incumbent upon authorities to encourage opportunities for access, sport and recreation, to retain and enhance landscapes and biodiversity. To close, another quote from the Planning Practice Guidance website of the Department for Communities & Local Government – “essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence ” (my italics) Staffordshire Moorlands is an, often, unsung gem in the English landscape. Please look after it, not spoil it for future generations.	• See response to Petition regarding Landscape Impact. • See response to Petition regarding highways. • See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7256 PO7259	Mrs A M Latham Mr & Mrs G A Bond				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site as it is: Contrary to Green Belt Policy in the NPPF; Contrary to the recommendations of the Green Belt Review study; Inadequate access to site, unacceptable increased levels of traffic generation, new school would impact on the quality of life of neighbouring residents. Significant harm to Knypersley's sense of place. Contrary to Historic Environment Character Assessment Report. Detrimental impact on landscape and wildlife.	• See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances • See response to Petition regarding highways. • See response to Petition regarding residential amenity e.g. noise from school, parking problems • See response to Petition regarding Heritage impact • See response to Petition regarding Landscape Impact • See response to Petition regarding Ecology
PO9045	Mr and Mrs Siddorn		G. Willard		Object	Object to the inclusion of this site.	Comment noted.
PO9033	The Hart Family		Rob Duncan		Object	This site is identified within the Local Authority's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as being: "Unsuitable for development, relatively isolated from built dev and historical interest (former parkland to Knypersley Hall)" The Local Authority's Green Belt Review identifies that the site as a whole, including all the surrounding land to the south, west and east which was also assessed, has a moderate overall impact insofar as the purposes of the Green Belt are concerned, and that it is a significant parcel of land that cannot be readily subdivided because of an absence of clear internal boundaries. It goes on to comment that the site is well contained physically, although such conclusions are not directly relevant to this particular site, which has limited defensible boundaries. Those conclusions relate to the wider parcel of land. The Review suggests that comprehensive master planning of the site incorporating the retention of existing open space and sports pitches, could yield a development which would help to reinforce wider Green Belt function. Those conclusions however relate to the much wider parcel of land which is enclosed by Mill Hayes Road and the Congleton Road. Site ADD04 by comparison is a much smaller parcel of land with poor enclosure and will appear as a strident, incongruous incursion into the Green Belt. The development of the site will furthermore relate badly to the existing settlement morphology, appearing as a southerly projection into an otherwise open and undeveloped area, with no housing to the east, west or south. The conclusions from the Green Belt Review are therefore not considered to be directly applicable to site ADD04 and I would suggest that on settlement morphology grounds alone it should not be a preferred option for housing within the Submission Version of the Site Allocations DPD. In terms of highway safety, the Local Highway Authority identifies that an access through onto the A527 would be preferred. However, site ADD04 does not include sufficient land to take a vehicular access onto the A527, and there is furthermore a large portion of public open space located between the two. As such an access would need to be taken off Harlech Drive, which is less favourable. As with site ADD03, the site is in multiple ownerships. Responses are still awaited from registered landowners and as such its availability for housing is not	• The relevant SHLAA record, BD131, covers a much larger area than ADD04 and does not support development of this larger area with the main reason being constraints from existing uses in the area, particularly the sports clubs. The SHLAA will be updated to reflect this smaller area and also the fact that since the record was written, recent evidence has emerged regarding landscape and heritage constraints. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances • See response to Petition regarding Landscape Impact • See response to Petition regarding highways. • The owners of ADD04 have confirmed to the Council that the land is available for development. • See response to Petition regarding Heritage impact • The Local Plan production process, by its very nature, involves several stages of consultation at which point anyone can suggest further sites for inclusion in the plan and the Council decides on whether they are appropriate. This site was suggested as part of the site options consultation.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						yet known. Adjacent landowners have indicated willingness for their sites to be developed, but the Local Authority, owing to heritage impact concerns, does not consider these other sites appropriate. The site furthermore did not appear as an option within the initial Site Allocations. Consultation, and was given a classification of 'C' within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, with its isolated location away from built development and potential impact on the setting of parkland associated with Knypersley Hall being constraints. Given the above, this site should not be taken forward as a preferred option.	
PO9966	Mr C Lunt				Object	Building here would encroach too closely to Stoke-on-Trent, again Biddulph identifies itself separately from S-o-T, that's what attracts people here and why it's such a nice place to live.	See response to Petition regarding loss of Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances
PO10005	Mr Ray Lloyd				Object	I do not support this proposal.	Comment noted.
PO10015 PO10098 PO8691 PO8828 PO8382 PO8315 PO7203 PO7682 PO6998 PO6225 PO4876 PO6017	Mrs C Cliffe Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding Mrs Joan Draisey Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch Mr John James Mr A Hague Mr M Seddon Mrs G Weston Mr R Lawton Mrs P Newton mr allan knapper Mrs L Price				Object	Object.	Comment noted.
PO1196	Mrs Y Pointon				Support	Excellent idea to build new schools to accomodate new families.	Comment noted.
PO7584	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements.	Comment noted.
PO10041 PO10031 PO10153 PO9865 PO7452 PO8621 PO7739 PO7699 PO8079 PO9661	Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt Mrs B Rowland Mr Gayle Mr K Flannagan Mrs M Booth Mrs E Griffiths Mr J Shelly Mrs V Jackson Mr and Mrs A D Lawton				Support	Support.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation ADD04 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9683 PO10136 PO10176 PO10084 PO10065 PO10189 PO10165 PO9993 PO10200 PO10122 PO10110 PO8311 PO7125 PO7361 PO7144 PO5060 PO5454 PO6180 PO5015 PO5043 PO4905 PO6329 PO6524	Mrs P Hancock Mrs Anne Young Mr Robert Chambers Mrs Claire Meadowcroft G B Ford Rev Lindsay Clowes Mr N Clowes Mr D Cliffe Mrs I Tranter Mr R Meadowcroft Mrs V Whiston Mr A Hague Mrs A Cunliffe Mr E Hilditch Mr A Atkinson Ms Philippa Swindells Ms Diane Copeland Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr R Milner Mr G Boulton Mr B Barcoft Ms S Wilson Mr S Wilshaw						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO2589	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO4911	Mr B Barcoft				General comment	neither support or object	Comment noted.
PO6544 PO6992 PO5715 PO5753 PO7287 PO7185 PO6801 PO8379 PO8148 PO8052 PO8013 PO8030 PO7987 PO7972 PO7166 PO7856 PO7352 PO8968 Mrs P Hindmarsh PO8555 PO8403 PO8071 PO10094 PO7954 PO8636 PO8613	Mrs Ann James Mr R Lawton Mrs D Whalley Mr J Hammond Mrs C Dale Mr A Nixon Mr M Owen Mr John James Ms Janet Lawton Mr B Hyde Mr N Goode Mr K Parry Mrs A Brown Mrs C Hensor Mrs G Hall Mr H Whalley Mr E Hilditch Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr R Scales Mr G Price Mrs V Jackson Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding Mr A Lehepoo Mr R Booth Mrs M Booth				Object	I object	Comment noted.
PO762	Mr Paul Malkin				Support	This site is ideal for development, close to the town centre, easy access to A527	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5064	Ms Philippa Swindells				Support	I support this site	Comment noted.
PO5451	Ms Diane Copeland						
PO5597	Mr Lewis Williams						
PO5837	Mr Carl Mason						
PO5858	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO5738	Mrs Eileen Smith						
PO5815	Mr Christopher Slater						
PO5639	M Mitchell						
PO6048	Mr Reg Grimwood						
PO5692	Mr Jason Eardley						
PO6193	Mrs Alison Wickstead						
PO6174	Mr and Mrs D Barclay						
PO5794	Mr Stephen Clowes						
PO6013	Mr P Price						
PO6001	Mrs L Price						
PO5665	Mr K Davies						
PO5008	Mr R Milner						
PO5539	Mrs M Moffatt						
PO5774	Mr E Pearl						
PO5580	Mrs S Wilshaw						
PO5560	Mr R Wilshaw						
PO7064	Mr C Kisicki						
PO6587	Mrs Beverley Holding						
PO6653	Ms Heather Mason						
PO6449	Mr Norman Smith						
PO6564	Mr Jeffrey Leese						
PO6673	Mrs J M Slater						
PO7042	Mr and Mrs B Carter						
PO6428	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO6822	Mr D Wickstead						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5389	Mrs S Harper						
PO5404	Mr G Harper						
PO5433	Mrs K Hallam						
PO6028	Mr T Barker						
PO6980	Mrs M Elmhurst						
PO6955	Mr K Allen						
PO7012	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO5522	Mr N Moxon						
PO5497	Mr M Cook						
PO5415	Mrs L Cook						
PO5466	Mrs J Moxon						
PO6899	Mr M Mason						
PO6879	Mr G Mason						
PO6847	Mrs I Latta						
PO6081	Mr I Frisby						
PO6063	Mr R Blood						
PO6098	Mr D Cantrill						
PO6118	Mrs J Frisby						
PO6135	Mrs J Collier						
PO6154	Mr K Collier						
PO6786	Mrs A Jones						
PO6409	Mr P Squires						
PO5962	Mr M Clews						
PO5370	Mr S Leese						
PO6285	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO6362	Mr V A Bainbridge						
PO6634	Mr Ronald Bailey						
PO7386	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7330	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO7534	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs						
PO7227	Mrs L Goodwin						
PO6467	Mr K Rowland						
PO6695	Mrs D Cook						
PO6241	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO6394	Mr B Wilson						
PO6219	Mrs P Newton						
PO6323	Ms S Wilson						
PO8269	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8510	Mrs Gillian						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8128	Flannagan Ms Barbara Griffiths						
PO8424	R Hutton						
PO7934	Mr C Kirkham						
PO8364	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO8472	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO8452	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO8491	Miss L Delves						
PO8183	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst						
PO8308	Mr A Hague						
PO8164	Mrs Angela Turner						
PO8093	Mr K Davies						
PO7836	Miss L Siddorn						
PO7892	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO7912	Mr J Swindell						
PO8203	Mr D Smith						
PO7119	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7101	Miss E Booth						
PO7109	Mr S Booth						
PO7497	Mrs L Carter						
PO7253	Mr A Weston						
PO7561	Mrs G Weston						
PO7138	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7442	Mr K Flannagan						
PO7420	Mr J Banister						
PO8729	mr Stephen Willott						
PO8749	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8841	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO8822	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO8912	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe						
PO8931	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8869	Mrs J.A. Bennett						
PO8685	Mrs Joan Draisey						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8593 PO8664 PO8705 PO8770 PO8784 PO8222 PO8236 PO7712 PO7732 PO7780 PO7693 PO8349 PO8329 PO8288 PO8535 PO8574 PO8888 PO7869 PO8112 PO9654 PO9690 PO9799 PO10134 PO9996 PO10169 PO10081 PO10062 PO10183 PO10158 PO10009 PO9984 PO10197 PO10119 PO10107 PO10037 PO10027 PO10145 PO9873	Mrs R Knapper Mr A Malbon Mr R Willott Mr J Whitehurst Mr S Holdcroft Mrs P Kelly Mr P Kelly Mr D Bradbury Mrs E Griffiths Mr R Hindmarsh Mr J Shelly Mr N Mosson Mrs S Bennett Mr R Cook Mr D Neal Mrs J Sailes Mr M Clews Mrs J Banister Mr A Forrester Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs P Hancock Mr Eric Biddle Mrs Anne Young Mr Ray Lloyd Mr Robert Chambers Mrs Claire Meadowcroft G B Ford Rev Lindsay Clowes Mr N Clowes Mrs C Cliffe Mr D Cliffe Mrs I Tranter Mr R Meadowcroft Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt Mrs B Rowland Mr Gayle						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD016 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4602	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Support	BD016 – already approved? recommended for inclusion.	Comment noted. There is no recent planning history on this site at the time of writing.
PO7579	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements	Comment noted.
PO10052	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	Support development here, it would balance out the town and access from these sites is easily achievable. They are within walking distance of the town centre.	Comment noted.
PO9834	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				Support	Support development of this site. Residents are more likely to use the facilities of the town if they live within walking distance and commuters to the Potteries will be able to access their places of work without travelling through the town centre.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1310	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary) We wish to emphasise the need to carefully consider the allocation of new housing sites in close proximity to our wastewater treatment works. In this regard we note that our wastewater treatment works (WwTW) in your local authority include: Biddulph WwTW; Biddulph Park WwTW; and Flash WwTW. We wish to highlight that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. Therefore if you are considering any sites for new allocations, especially housing allocations, near to a wastewater treatment works, you should carefully consider the sites with your Environmental Health colleagues. This is important when comparing sites close to treatment works with potential alternative sites that may be available to you for allocation. This reflects our earlier correspondence to you. The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet housing needs, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites, which are sensitive receptors, that are not close to a wastewater treatment works. We note this point is particularly relevant to your assessment of sites considered for allocation in Biddulph as part of the current Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation. In particular, site references BDO68, BDO62 and BDO87, which are sited in close proximity to Biddulph Wastewater Treatment Works. Notwithstanding this preference, if it is still intended to progress with the allocation of sites near to a wastewater treatment works for housing following discussions with your Environmental Health colleagues, we strongly recommend that your decision should be informed by: 1. an odour impact assessment; and 2. a noise assessment. If after having undertaken these assessments you still allocate land near to the wastewater treatment works for housing, we recommend that there should be detailed associated policy which identifies the need for mitigating measures including any that may be identified as a result of the assessments. We recommend that: 3. careful masterplanning is always prudent in order to mitigate the risk of odour and noise nuisance. For example, any on-site open space should be located so as to act as a buffer between the treatment works and any newly introduced housing. In addition the houses could be orientated so to most appropriately manage the impact of noise; and 4. appropriate soft landscaping is included to strengthen the buffer between the treatment works and the proposed new development.	Comments noted. An Odour Assessment has been produced by the land owner. Since these comments were sent to the Council, United Utilities has agreed that the issue of odour has been effectively addressed in the land owner's odour report. "Further to recent correspondence, United Utilities does not require any further odour impact work subject to the inclusion of the buffer you have proposed in your email of 5 December 2016 and the inclusion of appropriate landscaping boundary treatments." The developer considered that no noise report was necessary. It is now up to the Council to balance the planning issues in determining whether to select this site for development in the Local Plan. Detailed associated policy for the site will be included in the Local Plan if it is selected and it is acknowledged that careful master planning of the site will be required including appropriate screening /buffering.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO2595	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO974 PO577	Mr Peter Turner Miss Louise Richardson				Object	Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. The feeder road (Essex Drive) is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – 7.5m and 7.8m sequentially (Standard = 10m) The feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) are both below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m and 4.7m respectively (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Mow Lane) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.25m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Essex Drive off Mow Lane is restricted from both directions by bridges with a maximum width of 5.15m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Mow Lane with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) – measured at 23m. The junction spacings and convergence at Congleton Road are far below highways design guidelines. (Standard = 40m opposite and 80m adjacent.) (Mow Lane and Halls Road are 0m adjacent and Smithy Lane opposite is 18m). Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “ Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development.” Serious Highways incidents are common place at the junction of Mow Lane, Congleton Road, Smithy Lane and Halls Road. Recent accident at 4.30am (outside of high risk high flow traffic times) on 20/5/16 relating to the Mow Lane junction with Congleton Road resulted in lane closures, traffic restrictions and spillage intervention by the fire authority.	The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a Transport Assessment.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO577	Miss Louise Richardson				Object	This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. Improvement works to the adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development. The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes the Biddulph Brook. Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. 1. "The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance." SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 2. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). 3. This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and the Environment Agency were forced to clear the pollution. 4. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. It contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: "The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is "appropriate for its location" in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution." SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11	• New housing development would make a contribution towards Biddulph's housing needs. • No contradiction with SMDC Core Strategy Policy SS5b 'Biddulph Area Strategy'. Sites within the urban area and an extension to the urban area are included as well as extensions in the Green Belt identified as part of the Green Belt Review as stated in the policy. • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. • An odour assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that the site could be developed without adverse impact on future residents. The developer considered that no noise report was necessary. • The Council's Phase 1 Habitat consultants consider the site habitats to be of nature conservation value at district level and have the potential to support bats and reptiles, which could allow the consideration of the site as an SBI or BAS. Further survey work would need to take place prior to any development to establish Site of Biological Importance (SBI) / Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS). Prior to any development an assessment would be required of the 2 trees for their potential to support roosting bats and a reptile survey. • A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next Preferred Options consultation.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						6. The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17,000 residents. The population of Biddulph as at 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of 885 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this facility. This will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the CIL. The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded "... the site is not recommended for potential development ...". It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. "The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets." SMDC LDF Core Strategy section C3 Green Infrastructure 8.7.17 Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy NE1 Natural Environments and the protection of land suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. The land has the potential to be designated as a Species Rich Farmland site. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species (evidenced in the Habitat survey). Bats and badgers are active on site (local knowledge) and English Bluebells (indicating ancient hedgerows) and marsh Orchids uncommon to Staffordshire have been found on site (Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings). The site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site once more detailed survey information is gathered and time should be allowed for this to take place before it could be considered for release from the greenbelt or as a potential housing site. The site displays some semi-natural characteristics and is within the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Species Rich Farmland Ecosystem Action Plan Area , where priority habitats and species include Hedgerows, as well as several priority bird and mammal species present on site. The primary objectives within this zone are the maintenance, restoration and expansion of species-rich grassland and to increase the connectivity of semi-natural habitats. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that the site is “ ... very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water which accentuates the value of the site.” This site is a vital wildlife corridor, linking linear habitats from two sides of the valley via the Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way. It is bounded by two ancient hedgerows to the west and east, and contains a swathe of broadleaved woodland with possible veteran trees. Halls Road playing Field leads out onto Mow Lane. The increased traffic generated by more housing here will add to the danger already there (no footpaths, bad corner, blind spots, etc.) There's football facilities and a new childrens play area here and access from the fields are pedestrian only. Not safe!	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO756	Mr Paul Malkin				Object	Save Biddulph's Green Belt - Firstly I would again like to comment that the Councils marketing of this consultation has been extremely poor, it has been left to residents associations and concerned residents to spread the bad news in their community. As council tax notices were sent to all residents a few weeks prior to the consultation starting then I would have expected the promotion of an important issue like this to have been included in that delivery. I feel SMDC have missed a real opportunity to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to produce a North Staffordshire plan that could deliver the required housing whilst protecting green belt and identifying brownfield sites to continue to regenerate the area. When I asked if this had been considered at the Biddulph consultation meeting the council officer advised me that this had not been considered as "nobody wants to live in Stoke". I find this attitude from a council officer pretty appalling and if this is the attitude of the planning team then no wonder an innovative partnership approach had not been considered. Stoke have been successfully regenerating and redeveloping brownfield sites in the area for many years and I believe SMDC could learn a lot from their approach. In addition Stoke and Newcastle are where the job opportunities are being created and many residents of Staffordshire Moorlands will travel there for work and leisure and probably would want to live in these areas. The proposed sites for development are not only in green belt areas, but also along the boundaries of existing residents. The sites are going to have a detrimental impact on current council tax payers of the district who purchased properties at an inflated rate due to overlooking beautiful open fields. These residents are not only going to lose their beautiful views but also thousands of pounds from the value of their homes. I propose a number of sites that will have a minimal impact on the green belt and current residents. The Mills in Station Road and Walley Street are in desperate need of repair or regeneration. These could either be developed into apartments for young first time buyers or older persons or demolished and new properties built. This accommodation is far better situated close to the town centre and will keep the area more in keeping of the newer properties around them. There is also old brownfield land available either side of Congleton Road in Knypersley, the former Victoria Colliery site and the land behind Bemersley recycling centre off Childerplay Road. All of these sites have much better access to the main roads than the proposed sites that are all reliant on single track country lanes. What is required locally is housing to meet the needs of local people, there are key issues to address, young people can not get onto the housing ladder and have to resort to renting that can cost more than mortgage payments and there is an ageing population that require housing to meet their needs. What I would expect the planning department to complete before any development plans are signed off is a thorough research project to identify what is actually required locally, what is affordable to the local community and what the mix of starter homes, shared ownership and social rent homes should be. The Housing and Planning Bill has recently	• The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke and Newcastle Councils have their own development needs to meet. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD062. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • It is agreed that affordable housing is needed locally. Site BD062 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes so will contribute to this need. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • Education - The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						been passed and this includes the development of starter homes for first time buyers as part of the affordable housing requirement. These homes can be for sale up to £250,000 outside of London. Local salaries of young first time buyers would not make these affordable, SMDC must ensure that affordable homes to purchase are for sale at a price that local people can afford. The type of houses that are required should also be researched, surely the requirement is for smaller affordable homes, 1 bed apartments for singles and couples and older people to downsize to and then 2 and 3 bed homes for young families. I also made a freedom of information request to the district council with regard to the recent development at Uplands Mill in Biddulph asking for the breakdown of owner occupation, shared ownership and social housing and how many nominations had been made for local people to the social landlord, unfortunately this has not been provided in time for me to include this within this response. The reason I made this request was to be able to identify if there was a need for social housing in Biddulph or if the housing association had to widen its search for tenants to the north west, which I believe to be the case. In addition to the above, the below comments are why I feel the proposed sites should be reconsidered. Highway - too narrow, single vehicle for most of Marsh Green Road and Well Lane. At the junction with Congleton Road the carriage way is raised in both directions making it extremely difficult to see fast moving traffic coming either way. Congleton Road to Stoke gets congested and backs up at Knypersley lights and Chell roundabout, this will get worse with other developments so residents will naturally take the lanes towards Gillow Heath and up to Mow Cop and Harrishead. These lanes are single tracks with blind bends, where the road widens in Gillow Heath parked cars make it difficult to pass and the bus currently has problems getting through. Pedestrians use this lane with no pavement going to cycle track and children going to school and numerous properties in Marsh Green Road lead directly onto road, any increased traffic will make these roads dangerous and put users of them more at risk. Construction traffic will also find these areas increasingly difficult to navigate. Environment - after heavy rainfall there is often smells from the sewerage plant and it is known to overflow into the stream. Following heavy rain Marsh Green Road is like a river for many hours with water flowing from the fields, should this water be caught in the drainage system the sewage works will be constantly overflowing. The sewerage works is already servicing more properties than it is designed to. Schools - as there are currently not enough first school places for children that live in the area, I assume the schools will be built first before any housing development. As a new first school is to be built has a review taken place to ensure that there will be places at the local middle and high schools to accommodate these additional children, or are class sizes going to increase resulting in a drop in educational standards?	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1333	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Site BD062 contains potentially high value areas of habitat and needs to be assessed against the current Staffordshire Local Wildlife Site criteria. The site also would have a 'stepping stone' role as it is adjacent to the Biddulph Brook corridor, a key green corridor through the urban areas of Biddulph that links to the wider countryside. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (site FID 122) reports that: 'The site is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerows, scrub, broadleaved woodland and running water, which accentuates the value of the site. The site itself consists of a potentially biodiverse woodland/scrub habitat mosaic. The importance of this site is notable as it contains a range of habitat structures of different heights.' Flora species recorded included tufted hair grass, soft rush, ribwort plantain and orchid species (unidentified due to season), which indicate that parts of the site have botanical interest. In addition The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Report dated 27th June 2014 by Leigh Ecology Ltd on behalf of Seabridge Developments (available publically as part of a submitted planning application) found a small marshy area on the site which contained 'yellow flag iris <i>Iris pseudacorus</i> , and sedge species and two orchid species, common spotted orchid <i>Dactylorhiza fuchsia</i> and southern marsh orchid <i>Dactylorhiza praetermissa</i> . ' Dogwood <i>Cornus sanguinea</i> is present on the site, and if not planted, is unusual to find, indicating semi-natural habitat. Several bird species were recorded, including priority species Dunnock and S taring. We also support the comments made by Mrs Angie Turner BSc MSc on this site.	Lockwood Hall Associates consider the site habitats to be of nature conservation value at district level and have the potential to support bats and reptiles, which could allow the consideration of the site as an SBI or BAS. The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended in order to establish SBI/ BAS status: - Assessment of the 2 trees for their potential to support roosting bats. - Reptile survey required.
PO1319	Mrs B Ratcliffe				Object	I am writing about the potential development site BD062. This site is very close to the sewage works and is already several thousand over its capacity. There are photos of raw sewage flooding the site and into the brook. I have lived here since 1970 and have over the years seen a variety of wildlife and plants of which some are very rare. On a safety aspect there is no access to the site other than York Close. Mow land is very narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic and pedestrians occur often. York Close itself is very narrow especially on the 2 steep bends. The land has no suitable safe access. It is a small piece of land rich in wild life and plants that in it should be very important to all of us and it is vital that we sustain all of these things.	- See response to PO577 regarding existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works and ecology. - See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO10280	Cllr Chris Wood				Object	Sites such as BD062 and BD068 are completely unacceptable because the authority has a duty of care to ensure smell from sewerage works do not cause issues for housing within the proximity of the sewerage works and the site in Biddulph does emit odour which is both distasteful and unpleasant.	See response to PO577 regarding existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works and ecology.
PO953	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				Object	New houses should only be built where there is minimal environmental impact. Houses should not be built in such proximity works to a sewage works.	See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour in relation to the sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1107	Ann Wright				Object	What type of provisions would be provided for the stream and river management for the houses in Akesmore Lane? Also the water treatment facility as this is at capacity NOW. The proposed plots BD062 and BD068 would stop the treatment plant from being enlarged and at the moment the odours from the present plant are terrible as you walk along the track or Long Valley Road.	See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.
PO2704	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	2 sites in Biddulph are adjacent to the same watercourse. There is a floodplain extent on the western boundary but this is poorly defined at present. A level 2 assessment will be required for these.	The site boundary can be amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2 at the request of the landowner, who does not own this land and is not promoting it for development. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site.
PO4642	Mrs Alys Gregory				Object	I believe BD062 is totally unsuitable for building on, it is directly opposite sewage works, it is a marshy area that becomes water logged. Building on it does not contradict the SMDC LDF Care Strategy Policy. The council says it will refuse schemes of pollution and sensitive areas which are adjacent to the polluting developments. This site is a natural habitat and has been for more than 50 years, there is no feasible access to this land, and there are no jobs in the area. The lanes in Gillow Heath are very narrow and barely cope with the existing traffic, sewerage work is already over capacity, I am therefore saying no to this site.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise, odour and capacity of sewage works and ecology. - The part of the site within Flood Zone 2 has now been removed from the allocation. - New employment areas are also proposed for Biddulph in the draft Local Plan. - See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO4635	Mrs Wendy Boothroyd				Object	I do not think these areas are suitable for housing for the following reasons: Access Marshgreen Road is a narrow road in some places less than 10feet. With steep banks and in one part it is single track with a very sharp blind bend leading to a narrow bridge which crosses the cycle tracks. An increase in traffic would be very hazardous to people walking the tracks. Also this round is not suitable for heavy vehicles. There is no street lighting which makes it very dangerous for the children walking to school. Landscape The land between Portland Drive there is a deep gulley which was once a water course. This has been culverted but when it rains heavily it still floods. Local knowledge is that the land in this area is unstable due to shifting sand which would make it unsuitable for housing. Flood Plain The land adjacent to Biddulph Brook, and again particularly the level of the Brook rises causes flooding issues. When I moved here my insurer could not transfer my insurance because the post code flagged up as a flood risk area. Housing being built nearer the Brook could possibly find themselves un insurable as company's now ask if your 100 meters of a water course, Sewage Works The sewage works is screened by trees for part of the year, but during the Winter Months is quite visible. Housing in this area would have a clear view if the metal structure, and quite often when work is being carried out large floodlights are used. Also the noise when the pumps are going is obtrusive in Portland Drive, also the smell on occasion is very offensive so property nearer would even more inconveniences which could become an environment issue. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the	- See response to PO974 regarding highways. - See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. - See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour and existing raw sewage flooding. Screening would be required as part of any new development. - United Utilities have responded to this consultation raising these issues and a Council response to this can be found on page 1 of this table. - In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD062 for release from the Green Belt. - See response to PO756 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						following statement by letter dated 26 th May 2016: We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the waste water treatment works with their Environment Health colleagues, and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a waste water treatment works. Green Belt The government have emphasised the importance of Green Belt in preserving communities in their areas. These sites form a natural barrier with Gillow Heath and if these sites plus others were developed semi-rural areas would be engulfed and densely populated suburb without Green spaces will be formed. Infrastructure Development on this site would fall into the catchment area for Woodhouse Middle School, and Oxhay School, both schools are always well subscribed and therefore maybe unable to cope with a large intake. Also the junction on Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road has very poor visibility and increase in traffic would make the junction more hazardous and dangerous. Amenity The properties adjacent to the Green Belt in Portland Drive are all single story dwellings, and regulations state that new development should be in keeping with these properties. If this is the case then development on this land could only consist of single storey dwelling's as loss of light and privacy would be an issue to existing properties. Additional Sites As Brownfield sites are supposed to be the preferred option, there is a large area of the properly restored former Victoria Colliery on Brown Lees Road. Also there is a large area of land east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph allocation with very little impact on existing residents with ready access to main road and bus services.	comment on the content of that application.
PO4989	Mr C Kisicki				Object	This site has been open land and a wildlife haven for many years and provides a public access to Biddulph Valley Way. Its proximity to the already overloaded sewage works renders it unsuitable for any further development in this location. The roads around Gillow Heath are very narrow and can't cope with any major developments as it is very unlikely that Mow Lane will be very much improved and widened, especially at the very narrow Congleton Road end. Reclaimed Brown Field land of the former Victoria colliery site should be looked at first rather than the building on Akesmore Lane which is green living for the people of Biddulph and the surrounding landscapes add to the attractiveness of the Town. The former colliery spoil heap site may technically be regarded as Green Belt land but if possible should be developed for housing.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology and capacity of sewage works. • If this site were to be developed, the developer would be required to maintain a public access on to the Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO756 regarding Victoria Colliery as an alternative location for development.
PO4992	Mr W H Lunt				Object	No elected person should allow houses to be built in BD062 so close to a sewage works that smell continuously and is very noisy that this is not the fault of United Utilities because as we all know muck stinks and this must prove to be a health hazard of which no one should be faced with. I think that this site should be included as visual or public open space. Photo (see attached) shows traffic on York Close leading to the site.	• See response to PO577 regarding sewage works noise and odour. • The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016). Local Green Space supersedes the Visual

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							Open Space designation (which is an old designation not supported by Government policy in the NPPF). See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO4985	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Close proximity of the sewerage works which already causes noise and odour (almost on a daily basis) and raw sewage flooding in York Drive, Essex Close, Long Valley Road, + Marsh Green Road. The SMDC local plan phase 1 habitat survey stated that this site is NOT RECOMMENDED for potential development – it is the only site surveyed where this was concluded; Loss of Green Belt - no exceptional circumstances; This site is extremely wet for the majority of the year which indicates presence of a wet meadow; People who live in Gillow Heath because of its surrounding Green Belt areas. Building on this land will discourage people from living here and make the area less attractive to residents; There are other areas within Biddulph which are more suitable to build on where access will not be a problem, Mow Lane, Essex Drive and York Close do not meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways design guide policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bends are too small. There is no footpath on Mow Lane which means it is already very dangerous. There is no scope for the required improvements. The site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the community infrastructure and will not benefit Gillow Heath. This land is used by the local community and there has been a total open access since the estate was built. This land should be designated as visual open space, protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding and water course by slowing the runoff. Three public rights of way cross this land. I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - See response to PO577 regarding ecology. - If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. - See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. - See response to PO974 regarding highways. - Site BD062 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. - See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. - See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.
PO4991	Mr and Mrs B Carter				Object	As a resident of York Close for over 35 years and I am well accustomed to the smell of raw sewage from the treatment works despite work being carried out to alleviate the problems. The site is already operating at 15% above the desired capacity – increasing this by 35% above would make it even more ineffective. The facility needs to be expanded to cope with the future growth and close to the land close to the site should be reserved for the purpose and this purpose only. Despite the efforts of the developer to raise the site to ground thereby destroying the natural wildlife habitat that has existed for well over 40 years (site ref: ? 122 phase 1 habitat survey) both natural flora and fauna would be given every opportunity to do so, bringing the site back into line with sec with Sec 40 – Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - See response to PO577 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4996	Ms Janet Lawton				Object	The sewage system is only reported to serve 17.000 residents, however looking the census for 2011 shows those 19.892 residents a further increase will put more pressure on an already unsuitable system. The site is currently protected by Green Belt; the site is a flood 2 zone. The presence of a wet meadow evidences the current high level of surface water run-off, this site experiences development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in raw sewage overflow close to the new development. Distributor Road and Mow Lane and feeder roads like Essex Drive and York Close are too narrow, the road bend radi are to small there is a 2 pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane, which con not be avoided. There is no foot path on Mow Lane which means there will be a increase in traffic will increase the danger to pedestrians access my fire engines to most distal aspect of the proposed development would not guaranteed due to narrow roads and on street parking, vehicles would not access the development safely when delivering building goods. The roads were not built to consistently withstand HGVS or the increase in traffic. For over 40 years There has been total open access and the land used recreationally by local resident's. During 1970's and 1980's this land was used for grazing cattle. The site will deliver too few homes to add a measurement contribution to the community infrastructure it will not bring any benefit to Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF core strategy Biddulph area strategy improvements to feeder and distributor roads are not possible due to the small scale nature of development.	• See response to PO577 regarding capacity of sewage works and existing raw sewage flooding. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • The land is privately owned and has a footpath across it linking to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b.
PO5056	Ms Philippa Swindells				Object	i do not support this site	Comment noted.
PO4994	Mrs Patricia M Lunt				Object	This s ite is much in flora, bees, bats, birds, rabbits and foxes. The residents have laid a pathway to the Biddulph Valley Way which is used by hikers, cyclist, bird watchers, and the general public. Children climb the trees and enjoy learning about the nature on this Green Belt Land. Areas are mowed by residents to keep it safe and tidy. The sewage works smells dreadful in the summer very noisy at night. The trees are there to conceal the works, We have lived here for 44 years and we want this land to remain Green Belt in all its natural beauty.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to Po4996 regarding public access to the site • See response to PO577 regarding odour in connection with the sewage works. • Screening of the sewage works would be required as part of any development on the site.
PO4613	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	BD062 - Poor Access, sewerage works close by, smell and noise. Unsuitable for development, not recommended for inclusion.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour in connection with the sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4998	Mr P Burns				Object	I object to housing near to the treatment works in Gillow Heath as it would affect the wildlife area and also the treatment works can't cope as it already smells so bad in the hot weather. I object to building in City Bank Gillow Heath, we already have a big problem with traffic from the pub and it has no car parking so the village can't cope with any extra traffic it's a danger. Use some of the derelict building before spoiling our countryside.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour and capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO756 regarding use of derelict buildings in Biddulph.
PO4984	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs				Object	Destruction of wildlife, access roads in Gillow Heath not suitable for more traffic. The impact it will have on the sewage works.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO5005	Mr R Milner				Object	I support housing allocation/development on the site - no	Comment noted.
PO5025	Mr F Moorhouse				Object	I have objections to this site being used for housing allocations/development within Biddulph? yes	Comment noted.
PO4981	Mrs C Dale				Object	The sewage works near out home is over worked now the stench some days is terrible so more houses would make it horrendous.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour and capacity of sewage works.
PO4980	Mrs L Goodwin				Object	The proposed housing allocations for Biddulph are excessive; the town has already grown way in excess of some of the facilities needed to service the population. Heaven forbid that any building takes place to the South of the town, or we will become another suburb of Stoke on Trent, worrying as there are only a couple of fields separating us already. I wholeheartedly agree with and endorse the objections as given in the documents site BD062 (FID122) summary of objections (evidence and details).	• The proportion of 20% of the District's housing development taking place in Biddulph has been through extensive consultation and public examination as it is taken from the Council's Core Strategy which was adopted in March 2014. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. • See response to PO756 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							• See response to PO4994 regarding site screening • See response to PO756 regarding use of derelict buildings in Biddulph.
PO4977 PO4976	Mr A Nixon Mrs G Hall				Object	Sewage Works – Odour is already present on Essex Drive and further afield, I can't imagine it being at all pleasant for residents if houses are built even closer to the sewage works. We frequently see lovely wildlife in Essex Drive including foxes, squirrels and rabbits. These and many more species are all supported by the surrounded Green Belt Land. Flooding has caused problems in the past in Essex Drive and our garden was once seriously flooded after heavy rainfall and Biddulph Brook rose to a very worrying high level. When the water eventually cleared from the garden we were still left with an awful knotweed problem. We genuinely don't believe the tiny contribution of building so few homes on site BD062 would be worth the consequences of doing so.	• See response to PO577 regarding odour issue and existing raw sewage flooding in respect of the sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.
PO4898	Mrs K Hallam				Object	I support housing allocation/development on the site - no	Comment noted.
PO4993	Mrs D Stuttard				Object	I object to this proposed site due to it being Green Belt. Flood risk, my garden has been flooded twice over the past years. The roads are too narrow for emergency vehicles, the sewage works cannot take any more houses being built nearby. This site should remain in the Green Belt also for natural environmental habitat.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding existing raw sewage flooding and capacity in respect of the sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4990	Miss E Booth				Object	This site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph, which is already working above its desired capacity of 17000 people. We already experience unacceptable levels of noise and odours and raw sewage flooding the system during heavy rain. The local residents of Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes, such as noise odour, raw sewage and flooding, when the system back fills and pollutes Biddulph Brook and household drains. Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts the SMDC LDF core strategy where the council had already stated that it will refuse schemes which are pollution sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. Neither the distributor roads (Mow Lane) nor feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highway's Design guide policy. The roads bend radii are too small. There are 2 pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane very dangerous roads with no footpath on either side in parts. There is no scope for the required developments. This site is not recommended for development, it was the only site where this was concluded, showing that the other site were more suitable. The other site is important because of its mixed habitats, particular species found in its vital wildlife corridor linkages. This site is currently protected as Green Belt and is only suitable for release from the Green Belt and only in exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Green Belt prioritises development in the flood plain when other sites are available. The roads around the site meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways design guide policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too narrow. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. For over 40 years the community have had an unfettered access to this site, and the land is used by local residents and children alike. The site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the community infrastructure very, and will bring no direct benefit to Gillow Heath community.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.
PO4987	Mr S Booth				Object	The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph and is already over its maximum capacity. The SMDC local plan phase 1 habitat survey concluded the site is not recommended for potential development. The site is currently protected as Green Belt and only considered suitable under exceptional circumstances. The local community have had an unfettered access to the site since the estate was built in 1971 and there are well used public rights of way across this land. This site will deliver too few homes to add any measurable contribution to the community of Gillow Heath.	• See response to PO577 regarding capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4986	Mrs L Carter				Object	It is the next to sewage works, which is already working over its designated capacity population. The development of the sewage works needs planning PRIORITY. There are already problems: Odours and raw sewage flooding. Biddulph Brook is polluted when the system backfills in periods of heavy rain. There is overflow from the man hole cover at the end of Essex Drive. The idea of building houses next to a sewage works contradicts SMDC LDF core strategy policy 4. The feed roads (York Close/Essex Drive) to the site are far too narrow I do not meet the minimum standards for SCC Highways design guide policy. The bends are too tight. The distributor road, Mow Lane, is also too tight. The distributor road, Mow Lane, is a country lane, dangerous + has no footpaths! There are 2 pinch points (over bridges) which cannot be avoided whichever way you drive to Essex Drive + York Close. The site is very wet and is a flood plain. Phase 1 habitat survey stated that the site was not recommended for development. If houses are built the water will be displaced and will cause more flooding's in Biddulph Brook and surrounding areas.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - See response to PO974 regarding highways. - See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. - See response to PO577 regarding ecology.
PO4982	Mr A Weston				Object	Mow Lane a dangerous road already too much traffic. This field is a haven for wildlife and has always been walked by local residents. Sewers – smell most of the weeks. Building site will not be beneficial to our community.	- See response to PO974 regarding highways. - See response to PO577 regarding ecology. - See response to PO577 regarding odour issue in relation to the sewage works. - See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.
PO4983	Mrs G Weston				Object	Save our Green Belt. Mow Lane is already dangerous with no footpath.	- See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. - See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO4995	Mr R Lawton				Object	The sewage works system works cannot cope as the site experiences an overflow of raw sewage, which runs into Biddulph Brook latest floods were Nov 15 and March 16. We experience noise and odour and raw sewage pollution. The sewage system is reported to be servicing 17000 residents. The 2011 census shows that 19892 residents with the proposed York Close/Essex Drive development and the Portland Drive/Marsh Green Road development this would add 135 properties and a 400 to 500 residents putting even more pressure on the already unsuitable sewage system. Mow Lane the access road to York Close /Essex Drive is a narrow country lane not suitable for HGVs; there are no pavements for pedestrians which is a danger. The possibility of a further 40 houses, which means possibly 140 vehicles needing to access Mow Lane will add more pressure to an already narrow road, and cause more danger to pedestrians going down Mow Lane to narrow and when passing you sometimes have to stop as there is no room to pass safely. Exactly the same problems apply to Portland Drive/Marsh Green Road proposed developments, these roads cannot cope with the traffic we have now let alone a possible 270 plus cars using these unsuitable country lanes from the two proposed developments.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - See response to PO974 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4997	Mr A Atkinson				Object	Major concern for me is the traffic increase on Mow Lane this is an incident waiting to happen if the increase goes ahead some decision making councillor will be ultimately responsible for some innocent person's death. We have lived here at Essex Drive for 38 years and we had problems for the sewage works for all this time depending on the weather and the air conditions, to the point that during warm times all the windows and the doors had to be kept closed as the smell stung our throat. Also if one wanted to sell up it could have an effect whether a prospective buyer came on a stinky day. Also the access road is very narrow as most residents park in the street and park on the turning areas, Mow Lane is also a hazard so the increase in the traffic to the site would make it 40 times worse (that is only counting 1 car per household) There is no footpath on Mow Lane for school children and no way to step off Mow Lane to avoid the traffic when confronted with. The water table is high in this site so would increase the flow of rain water to the lower areas eventually flood the low lying land. We object to anymore housing in Gillow heath and the surrounding areas. My major area of concerns for the proposed dwelling at the end of York Close and Essex Drive, is the road infrastructure could not cope with any increase. Mow Lane is too narrow in parts and poor visibility along that stretch of the road i.e.: very sharp bends and there nipping points after the bridges and after the bridge, going westerly. Major concerns are and would be required at the junction with Congleton Road; it is hazardous to make a right turn there now. In the other direction the road has a severe nipping point at the bridge over the old railway line; visibility is also very poor here. From this bridge to Congleton Road there is little or no footpath. All schools are to the east of Congleton Road. I do not feel that the proposal does not supply a soak away to the surrounding area. As well as much used nature area.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding odour and existing raw sewage flooding in respect of the sewage works. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to Po4996 regarding public access to the site.
PO6730	Miss Laura Simcock				Object	I object to the proposed building here as it is ridiculously close to sewage works in this area, not only does it already give off foul smell already to houses on Long Valley Road but it would also be worse for new houses even closer, and therefore wrong to put more houses there. Furthermore, the sewage works is already struggling to cope with the amount of residents at present as it is known there is over flow problems that unsanitary waste regularly appears near to a neighbouring road called York Close, Gillow Heath.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6268	Mr N Mosson				Object	I am in full agreement with the accompanying sheets stating the objections (summary) to this site I have lived at this address since 1972 and remember the nights when the smell from the sewage works was overpowering necessitating keeping all the windows shut. I also used to work at the forge colour work's and remember the times at night when the out flows from the sewage works used to heavily contaminate Biddulph Brook. Allowing extra housing in this site could lead to the same problems again.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. • See response to PO756 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site • See response to PO4994 regarding site screening • See response to PO756 regarding use of derelict buildings in Biddulph.
PO7222	Mr B Roberts				Object	Northern plots – York Close, Marsh Green, Portland Drive. These developments are very close to the sewerage works. Problems remain with proximity and also capacity and space available for any possible need for expansion of the sewerage works.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.
PO6273	Mr Ronald Bailey				Object	I strongly feel that this site should be left as normal and a visual open space, keeping the habitat and the fauna certainly is a better zone for the necessary cover from the sewage works as outlined.	• See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6746	Mr Robert Chambers				Object	I am writing to voice my concerns about the site (above). I have lived next to this site for more than 40 years, and, consequently, have accumulated a lot of knowledge and experience about the characteristics of the area. I have also understood why revoking green belt status and giving planning permission for development have been refused on at least two occasions in the past. The Sewage Works and Public Health The nearest housing to the site of the sewage works is the eastern side of Long Valley Road. The Biddulph Valley Way and part of the field provide some distance, but not much. Despite the fact that the sewage works was upgraded some years ago, there are still frequent occasions throughout the year when a very strong odour pervades the air and can be experienced several streets away. There have been issues of flooding and raw sewage leakage near Essex Drive (March 2016 for example) and, in times of heavy or persistent rain, the site becomes very wet indeed (Marsh Green Road, which runs past the entry to the sewage works is aptly named). Additionally, the water that flows along the Biddulph Valley Way finds its way to the brook through this site. At times of heavy rain, the track becomes water-logged and river-like despite attempts to deepen the ditch behind the upper half of Long Valley Road and insert plastic drainage pipes into the site's field. The field itself becomes extremely boggy. The river at the eastern side of the site is liable to flood at times of high rainfall. Water run-off from building, roads, paths, drives would increase the likelihood of flooding downstream, too. Have projections been conducted to assess whether the capacity of the sewage works is sufficient for Biddulph and if the increase in population would adversely affect its ability to cope? Clearly, the complex is not able to cope adequately at the moment. In any case, it is clear that anything built on this site would be very close to the sewage works and to the river. Roads and Footpaths Infrastructure Mow Lane and Marsh Green Road are very narrow roads serving much of the Gillow Heath area. In places, there is insufficient room for vehicles to pass. Pedestrians have to use the road as there are no footpaths. At some points, there are no refuge areas at all. Mow Lane, which begins at the top of Congleton Edge is a major transit route from Congleton and the A34, as well as from Kidsgrove, and yet is woefully inadequate for purpose. As things stand, it is doubtful whether the road system is suitable without adding extra burden from potentially hundreds of extra vehicles, including the resultant noise and air pollution. Elderly people, the disabled and parents with young children who choose to walk to Biddulph or elsewhere would be compromised even more by extra traffic, and cars parked on pavements, which already occurs. Additionally, parents with prams and push-chairs would find using the roads or the already inadequate pedestrian areas more dangerous. Access to site BD062 is restricted. Essex Drive and York Close are narrow roads with steep gradients at points and sharp turns. Many people need to park cars on the road and pavements (as they do in many of the other roads in Gillow Heath). Some residents have vans for work which take up even more space. Ambulances, fire vehicles, delivery lorries and	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						waste/recycling vehicles would find the negotiation of these roads even more difficult. As has been pointed out elsewhere, Biddulph is essentially a dormitory town with very limited work possibilities and facilities. Consequently, a very large number of people have to commute to work, drop children off at school. All of this traffic would be funnelled into Mow Lane which has no footpaths. Any sites that led into Mow Lane or Marsh Green Road would create far too much traffic and would be potentially very dangerous. Mow Lane, Essex Drive and York close do not meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. Additionally, the area would be totally transformed, packing large numbers of houses into a relatively small area. Higher-density living would not have the infrastructure to serve it. Green Infrastructure The Green Infrastructure Strategy of SMDC seems to be somewhat inadequate. As has been stated elsewhere, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey stated that this site was not recommended for development. This is from the Green Infrastructure Guidance on the Natural England website. The highlighted sections are the pertinent ones: A healthy natural environment: Our diverse landscapes continue to provide inspiration and enjoyment for people and enable our wildlife to adapt to the challenges of the future. Our rich biodiversity thrives across the landscape, with ecosystems and habitats resilient to climate change. Our marine environment is better understood, valued and protected. Well planned Green Infrastructure encompassing new and enhanced sites and habitats: contributes to high quality and accessible landscapes benefiting people and wildlife; plays an essential role in maintaining and enhancing the health of the natural environment and its ability to provide a wealth of 'ecosystem services'; increases ecological connectivity to overcome habitat fragmentation and increase the ability of the natural environment to adapt to climate change ; and in coastal locations helps to provide recreational space and to enhance and protect our marine environment. People are inspired to conserve and value the natural environment: People fully understand and value the contribution of the natural environment to our quality of life. People increasingly take action to protect and enhance the natural environment. People have places to access and enjoy a high quality natural environment The creation and enhancement of green infrastructure helps to: create attractive and accessible places for people to enjoy direct and regular contact with the natural environment; strengthen links between urban areas and their surrounding countryside, and bring the natural world into every neighbourhood, with benefits for individual and community health and well-being. Twinned with effective promotional campaigns, green infrastructure can support healthier lifestyles by providing green routes for walking and cycling, and green spaces for exercise and play. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded that the site was not recommended for potential development, and the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities also states that where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						the urban fringe in enhanced. This site has the potential to be designated as a species rich farmland site, and also acts as a link between the Biddulph Valley Way and Biddulph Brook. A few months ago, the owner of the site felled most of the trees on the site. This suggested that either he was privy to information about the future of the site not being divulged to the public, or that it was an attempt to degrade the site and to reduce its biodiversity. The Phase 1 Habitat survey stated that this site was not recommended for development. The variety of habitats and the connection between the Biddulph Valley Way and the brook are obvious to us all. The site will not bring any benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. SMDC has stated that new housing allocation should be prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where this can help secure infrastructure improvements for the newly developed part of the town. Summary of Opposition I am concerned that development here would have detrimental effect on the biodiversity of the area, introduce a much higher risk of flooding, as outlined above, put greater stress on the water purification and sewage plant (and its continuing problems with odour and leakages) and put an unacceptable pressure on the narrow roads as well as putting drivers and pedestrians under greater risk of being hurt. Finally, it will bring no benefit to the community.	
PO7370	Mr John Hayley				Object	As a Biddulph resident I call on SMDC to remove areas BD062 & BD068 from the 2012-2031 Local Plan Preferred Option Sites. I believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council needs to consider the following: Areas: BD062, BD068 and BD083 1. In my view it is totally inappropriate to build new housing on green fields within the Green Belt in such close proximity to Biddulph's sewage treatment plant. I would not wish future generations of my family to have to live in such housing and it is not appropriate to make town boundary changes in this vicinity. It would be impossible to produce a "wide choice of high quality homes" at this location (NPPF paragraph 50) and the type of housing that could be built here is likely to have a large negative effect on social cohesion and quality of life within the existing Gillow Heath community. This development would harm the reputation of this area of Biddulph from a housing perspective. 2. Because of its proximity to the urban environment I believe that it remains sensible for the sewage treatment plant to be heavily surrounded by trees. One suitable productive use of this land might therefore be, not to use it for housing, but to use it instead to secure reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Options might include: carbon capture, forestry and coppicing, or creation of a small Community Forest – all done in support of a low carbon future for Biddulph.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO4994 regarding site screening. • The land is privately owned so a community forest is not likely to be achievable.
PO7589	Mr Gary Ratcliffe				Object	(Summary) In considering the proposal to develop the green belt land in Gillow Heath, Biddulph, the Developer and District Council need to agree on the level and scope of the transport assessment at the earliest	• The Highway Authority, Staffordshire County Council has stated that a Transport Assessment will be required and they will ensure that the level and scoping is appropriate.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						possible stage of design i.e. feasibility stage. The transport assessment must give due consideration to the Health and Safety of those that will be affected by the works during the lifecycle of the project i.e. construction of the development, use (including emergency access) and maintenance (including service vehicles). In regards to the construction phase, it should be noted that each year construction work injures and kills people who have no direct connection to the construction work itself. A basic desktop traffic risk assessment would consider the following: Problems with traffic: Pedestrians may be struck by vehicles entering or leaving the site Construction vehicles using unsuitable residential roads for access (see points below) Site and delivery vehicles may obstruct the pavement forcing pedestrians into the road where they can be struck by other vehicles Construction vehicles must pass each other on narrow residential roads Vehicles may strike non-site vehicles while entering or leaving the site Unsecured loads or those moved during transit may fall off, striking pedestrians or other vehicles People who may be harmed – residents, visitors, children and cyclists (it is well documented the number of fatalities and serious injuries involving cyclists and large construction vehicles) Recent development of the amenities on Mow Lane to encourage children into the locality Government and local policy to encourage the use of cycling and walking Increased potential for accidents due to the access roads – the physical restrictions of York Close, Essex Drive and Mow Lane have already been well documented by others residents. Narrow residential roads, poor visibility / sight distance restrictions and no pavement on Mow Lane Lack of segregation between pedestrians and cyclists and large / numerous construction vehicle Foreseeability – number of accidents and near-misses on these roads involving vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and children in recent years Significant traffic increase due to the number of construction vehicles required to construct 40 new dwellings Typical construction vehicles include 8 wheel tippers for the initial ground works, including spoil removal and deliveries – see photo and dimensions of typical construction vehicle. A traffic risk assessment (or traffic management plan) produced by the Developer could not reduce the risk to a tolerable level i.e. a risk that is acceptable to society in general. The existing environmental factors limit the control measures that could be implemented to mitigate the risk further i.e. it is not possible to: Segregate pedestrians and vehicles Divert site traffic away from pedestrianised areas Physically modify the access roads Time deliveries to avoid members of the public This is why a previous planning application for the area classified as BD062 failed due to the limited access for construction vehicles. There have been no changes to the physical environment or existing site use that would facilitate a reversal of this previous decision (this includes political pressure / incentives which are still bound by Statutory Law).	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7565	Mrs Angela Turner				Object	(Summary) Object to the proposal to develop this site for the following reasons: Issues with regards to habitats (refer to full details in the attached document) - it is the only proposed housing allocation in Biddulph where the Council's Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded that the site is "not recommended for potential development". Site BD062 links two vital wildlife corridors which travel through the Biddulph Valley and can be classed as a 'potential green infrastructure asset'. In addition to this, the site contains species indicative of habitats, which are both UK BAP and Staffordshire BAP priority habitats. It has the potential to deliver a number of outcomes of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy, including the identification of sites suitable for inclusion in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Species-Rich farmland zone. Time should be given for additional ecological surveys to be undertaken; The Council's evidence base is not complete - it has not produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy and it makes a commitment to do this in Core Strategy Policy C3; The sites inclusion contradicts the Biddulph area strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the new bypass where it is located adjacent to the urban area and where developments can help to secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of that part of the town. This site offers no scope for infrastructure improvements specific to Gillow Heath; Land is Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated; Lack of capacity of sewage works (refer to attached documents); Part of the Local Plan evidence base has not been fully researched, evidenced and made publically available. United Utilities have not submitted DG5 Flood Register data; Current lack of capacity results in regular overflow of raw sewerage into Biddulph Brook resulting in serious public health concerns, particularly if housing were to be built on the site of current overflows (see attached pictures); Amenity issues for current and future residents - noise, odour and sewage flooding; Inadequate highway infrastructure - past planning refusals, distributor roads and feeder roads do not meet minimum standards in Residential Design Guide SPG (2000), concerns over highway safety; The site is in Flood Zone 2; Local community has had unfettered public access to the site since the estate was built in 1971 - 3 well used Public Rights of Way cross this land; and Land should be designated as 'Visual Open Space' protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface water run-off.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. • See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6734	Mr Michael Martin				Object	Object to BD062 - it is TOTALLY unsuitable for development. ALL of these sites are within metres of a full to capacity sewerage works already working to overcapacity. We regularly have sewage smells, the nightly warring of machinery, and when walking in the adjacent fields have seen evidence of sewage overflow. The health limitations are obvious. The lane leading to BD087 is one cars width, no footpath, houses adjoining the lane have their own boundaries right up to the lane. Many years ago my wife and I together with numerous neighbours attended a site meeting at the actual works and were told by a United Utilities area manager that the houses in Portland Drive, York Close, and Long Valley Road should never have been built..... we register our total objections to this area. The preferred area was the old Victoria Colliery that has been totally reclaimed and is ready to use.	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - See response to PO974 regarding highways. - See response to PO756 regarding Victoria Colliery as an alternative location for development.
PO7575	Mr Peter Turner				Object	(Summary) Object on the basis of: Public Health / Proximity to Sewage Works Sewage works is over capacity, residents already experience unacceptable levels of amenity such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. Contradicts Core Strategy Policy SD4. During heavy periods of rainfall sewerage system cannot cope with existing levels of development and overflows. United Utilities have expressed a preference that the Council does not locate new development next to the sewage works. Habitats and Biodiversity The SMDC Phase 1 Habitat Survey recommended that the site is not recommended for potential development – it is the only site surveyed where this is concluded. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). Green Infrastructure Strategy does not exist. Inclusion contradicts Core Strategy policies C3 and NE1. Site has potential to be designated as a Local Wildlife Site. Green Belt & Flood Risk Site is flood zone 2 and its release would contradict Core Strategy Policy SD4. Highways Local highway network is inadequate to cope with new development. Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. Serious Highways incidents are common place at the junction of Mow Lane, Congleton Road, Smithy Lane and Halls Road. Recent accident at 4.30am	- See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. - United Utilities have expressed a preference but not a formal objection. It is up to the Council to balance all the planning issues and reach a decision. - See response to PO577 regarding ecology. - See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. - See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. - See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. - See response to PO974 regarding highways. - See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. - See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. - See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. - See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b. - See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						(outside of high risk high flow traffic times) on 20/5/16 relating to the Mow Lane junction with Congleton Road resulted in lane closures, traffic restrictions and spillage intervention by the fire authority. Community Access / Public Rights of Way The local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built in 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space, protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. Three well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land. Provision of community enjoyment of countryside and open spaces is supported by the Commons Act 2006. Wise use of CIL This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town.	
PO7355	Jenny Cryer				Object	I have very deep concerns over the development BD062. It is a lovely green pocket of land within a number of housing developments, which attracts a lot of wildlife. My concerns are that it is extremely close to the sewage works, so a considerable number of the houses on the proposed site would actually be right next to the works. I am also concerned about how the site will be accessed. Neither Essex Drive/ York Close, or Marsh Green Road are at all suitable, and what are currently quiet residential areas would become major thoroughfares. Gillow Heath and the surrounding area have quite enough residential properties in them already, without yet another small area of wild land being used for commercial gain. Please do reconsider.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO9046	Mr and Mrs Siddorn		G. Willard		Object	Object to inclusion of the site. The site has significant highway, drainage, ecology, odour and other constraints which local people will require the LPA to address.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9006	Mr Denver Johnson				Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices. The infrastructure of our little end of Biddulph has always been strained by the population level, to suggest that the number of houses could be doubled is ludicrous. The main drawbacks to our location have always been increasing traffic on the A527 (it's too crowded now), flooding (gardens in the best drained locations tend to get boggy in Winter - the weather is getting wetter and some local actions like selling off the Grange and allowing the marsh drying Rhododendrons to be mass destroyed didn't help) and when the wind is in the wrong direction, the smell from the close sewage works. The placing of large developments even closer to the sewage works seems more like a criminal act than a thoughtless oversight. The Abbeystead, Lancashire waterworks disaster of May 1984 where a methane gas explosion severely wounded forty four people and killed eight outright including a mother and child should never be allowed to be forgotten. The cause of ignition has never been determined, however the good sense of at the very least leaving as many fields as possible around them was once enforced by law. Private takeover of Public utilities seems to have greyed this issue. From an explosives perspective (I'm a Physical Science Graduate) placing houses closer to such an installation is akin to packing a bomb with shrapnel and strapping innocent victims to it! Won't allowing these developments be exponentially raising the risks of the site being used as a terrorist soft target? How many other locations are there Nationally like this one, with the added blast focus of the steep valley sides? New houses on the proposed sites would not just be putting lives of new residents at risk. Wildlife - Biddulph attracts some rarities like buzzards and herons, sustains a large population of wild rabbits along with frogs, toads, snakes, foxes, stoats, badgers and hedgehogs. Pheasants, crows jackdaws, jays, magpies, woodpeckers (green and spotted) along with a large variety of the smaller birds. All of these animals would be hit by the loss of the green spaces and the draining of marshland. Heritage - Biddulph originated in the lee of the old 13th century Norman fort/castle built in Bailys Wood. All of the Mediaeval village would have been centred on the brook. The road from the South along the brook would have been important, but the fair road that no longer exists, running East West through the village would probably have been more important to the community and the North road out towards Congleton may not have been there since the fort was put there to control the area boundary.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are "There are three Grade II Listed Buildings within the 400m buffer. The site was enclosed by surrounding vegetation and there is no intervisibility between the site and the assets. Development would be highly unlikely to adversely affect the settings of the assets. Development would be highly unlikely to adversely affect HLC zone BBHECZ 8 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms".

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Bradley Green was the name of the village now using the name Biddulph. See 1806 map: http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/maps/series?xCenter=3216685.06303&yCenter=2985192.16842&scale=633600&viewScale=181417.4208&mapLayer=nineteenth&subLayer=smith_1806&title=C.%20Smith%20New%20Map%20of%20Great%20Britain%20and%20Ireland&download=true Biddulph Castle - Biddulph Lea Forge http://www.gatehouse-gazetteer.info/English%20sites/3308.html Archaeology - ancient Biddulph is still buried below the fields (inc. BD087) between Marsh Green Road and Bailys Wood. Bakers South field (BD068), from hearsay, was called 'the old garrison' - it's sited ~1000M South West of the old Biddulph Hall and would have been a very probable place for a Parliamentary cannon battery during the Civil war. I've found shards of what appear to be iron age or older pottery in this field close to the brook. I've got this depiction from a mix of reading and hearsay, but am currently in contact with 'The Biddulph Museum'. See: http://biddulphmuseum.com/index.html Flooding - Marsh Green gets it's name from a long history of flooding. The glacial alluvial valley floor is an area for subsidence even without the help of the many mines close to the area and the existence of a large underground reservoir at our end of the valley that is the reason for there being less pit shafts this end. Access - Marsh Green road is a single track, dangerous to the many pedestrians that have to cross it daily on their way to the old railway line (Biddulph Valley Way - Route 55) and cars that face meeting on the sharp blind bend next to Suttons old farm. Marsh Green Road was at it's safest when it was blocked off at the sewage works entrance to facilitate work on the bridge over the brook. BD062 - has had a history of severe flooding. The field is boggy during the Winter and Spring with signs of subsidence. Biddulph brook regularly gets charged with raw sewage, it gets much of it's volume by taking the constant discharge from processed sewage: it is categorically 'unfit for human consumption'. The field provides a pleasant buffer zone between the houses of Gillow Heath and the sewage works and is often referred to as the village green.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9015	Mrs Angela Sproston				Object	(Summary) Public Health – proximity to sewage works The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph. Local residents on Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system and pollutes the Biddulph Brook. Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. Habitats and biodiversity Site reference FID 122 in the Phase 1 Habitat Survey The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “... the site is not recommended for potential development ...” It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Greenbelt and Flood risk The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Highways and Emergency Access Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. Unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way The local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built in 1971. For over 40 years, there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents. This land should be designated as Visual Open Space, protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do its natural job of reducing flooding in the watercourse by slowing down surface runoff. Three well-used Public Rights of Way cross this land. Wise use of the Community Infrastructure Levy This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • See response to PO577 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4570	Mrs L Jones				Object	Also sewage works at full capacity and proposed overlooked. Plots BD062 & BD068 would appear to prevent enlargement of the existing treatment works, also more Dr's places needed can't cope with what we have got.	• See response to PO577 capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO10000 regarding infrastructure.
PO8532 PO8069 PO8678 PO8591 PO8633 PO8611 PO8653 PO8661 PO8703 PO8719 PO8768 PO8782 PO8806 PO7730 PO8897 PO7691 PO8346 PO8286 PO8727 PO8747 PO8145 PO8181	Mr D Neal Mrs V Jackson Mrs Joan Draisey Mrs R Knapper Mr R Booth Mrs M Booth Mrs S Stanway Mr A Malbon Mr R Willott Mrs A Bagnall Mr J Whitehurst Mr S Holdcroft Mrs S Walters Mrs E Griffiths Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr J Shelly Mr N Mosson Mr R Cook mr Stephen Willott Mrs Maureen Whitehurst Ms Janet Lawton Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst				Object	i object	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8090	Mr K Davies						
PO8050	Mr B Hyde						
PO8011	Mr N Goode						
PO7985	Mrs A Brown						
PO7969	Mrs C Hensor						
PO7202	Mr M Seddon						
PO7808	Mr & Mrs J & A Twigg						
PO7824	Mrs E Shufflebotham						
PO7833	Miss L Siddorn						
PO7854	Mr H Whalley						
PO7889	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO7909	Mr J Swindell						
PO8201	Mr D Smith						
PO8220	Mrs P Kelly						
PO7117	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7348	Mr E Hilditch						
PO7099	Miss E Booth						
PO7107	Mr S Booth						
PO7483	Mrs L Carter						
PO7555	Mrs G Weston						
PO7135	Mr A Atkinson						
PO6799	Mr M Owen						
PO6465	Mr K Rowland						
PO6920	Mrs J Brennan						
PO6691	Mrs D Cook						
PO7517	Mr & Mrs R						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7221	& A Higgs Mrs L Goodwin						
PO7177	Mr A Nixon						
PO7156	Mr P Burns						
PO7380	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7328	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO6096	Mr D Cantrill						
PO6114	Mrs J Frisby						
PO6345	Mr N Lunt						
PO6132	Mrs J Collier						
PO6151	Mr K Collier						
PO6784	Mrs A Jones						
PO5712	Mrs D Whalley						
PO6632	Mr Ronald Bailey						
PO6860	Mr A Copeland						
PO6845	Mrs I Latta						
PO6839	Mr D Nixon						
PO6079	Mr I Frisby						
PO6820	Mr D Wickstead						
PO5386	Mrs S Harper						
PO5401	Mr G Harper						
PO5612	Mr A Barbeard						
PO6026	Mr T Barker						
PO6978	Mrs M Elmhurst						
PO6953	Mr K Allen						
PO7010	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO6374	Mrs K Chaddock						
PO6989	Mr R Lawton						
PO5520	Mr N						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5494	Moxon						
PO5413	Mr M Cook						
PO5464	Mrs L Cook						
	Mrs J						
PO6895	Moxon						
	Mr M						
	Mason						
PO7062	Mr C Kisicki						
PO7040	Mr and Mrs						
	B Carter						
PO7030	Mrs						
	Patricia M						
	Lunt						
PO5557	Mr R						
	Wilshaw						
PO5772	Mr E Pearl						
PO5578	Mrs S						
	Wilshaw						
PO5037	Mr G						
	Boulton						
PO5448	Ms Diane						
	Copeland						
PO5637	M Mitchell						
PO6045	Mr Reg						
	Grimwood						
PO5690	Mr Jason						
	Eardley						
PO6191	Mrs Alison						
	Wickstead						
PO6171	Mr and Mrs						
	D Barclay						
PO5791	Mr Stephen						
	Clowes						
PO5661	Mr K						
	Davies						
PO5628	Mrs B						
	Ratcliffe						
PO4869	Mr Allan						
	Knapper						
PO969	Mr						
	Christopher						
	Goldstraw						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9035	The Hart Family		Rob Duncan		Object	Whilst this site is acknowledged to have a limited impact on the Green Belt owing to it being effectively enclosed by existing development, the narrow and convoluted nature of Mow Lane and its poor junction with the Congleton Road, means that enhancements to the local highway network are likely to be necessary. By comparison, my client's site benefits from two existing vehicular access points onto parts of the highway network that are suitable for additional traffic, and which will enable vehicles to pass safely. The site is also highlighted as having District level importance from an ecological perspective, with the Local Authority's Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the site concluding that: "The site has potential for protected species to be present due to the mosaic of habitats and habitat structure present, especially as the site is well connected to the wider countryside. Therefore the site is not recommended for potential development as the site is deemed to have district ecological importance. (my emphasis). The unsuitability of the site from an ecological perspective lessens its overall suitability for allocation for housing land and I would request on behalf of myclient that this be re-considered.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9224	Mr Peter Wilshaw				Object	(Summary) The development of future Housing and any future Solar Farm installation would squeeze the natural life from the valley. It would deplete the Green Belt and detrimentally and dramatically alter the landscape and negatively affect the wellbeing of the people of Biddulph and in particular Gillow Heath. I hope that planners will reconsider the preferred option taking into account the following; Unsuitable road network . These proposed housing sites are situated along the gateways to our countryside and walking tracks e.g. Akesmore Lane, Holy Lane, Mow Lane and Marshgreen Road. These narrow roads already carry an unacceptable level of traffic which when combined with a heavy footfall of walkers with children and animals presents a real danger. This danger is also manifested in the fact that they all lead to crossroads on the A527 at Marshgreen and Smithy Lane which are difficult places to emerge from. If these lanes require widening or other safety upgrade it highly likely the ancient hedgerows will be destroyed and therefore the characteristics of that landscape lost for ever. Situating parking places at various spots on the west side of the valley at medium to high elevation would enable access to many walking tracks and elevate the mix of cars and people on the narrow lanes. Diminishing of the Green Belt in the short and long term. The release of Green Belt land, according to the NPPF, should only take place in "exceptional circumstances". There is not statement to say what those circumstances are and why land can be released in Biddulph and other places but, not in Leek? Site ADD03. Is it 300 or 70 houses plus a school? Unsuitable area adjacent to the Grade II listed White house (the oldest house and tourist attraction in Biddulph). Cumulative and Visual damage to the historic and characteristics of the north Staffordshire uplands area of Gillow Heath . Biddulph valley is also a gateway to the moorlands and The Peak District National Park. It was granted the title of "The Garden Town of Staffordshire" and over twenty years of volunteer effort to showcase the town, Biddulph in Bloom Charity has won many RHS Heart of England in Bloom awards and in 2015 came second in the National Large Town category. I feel that the location and magnitude of these developments will adversely affect the confidence, so hard fought for, in the effort to improve our town and increase tourism. Sites BD062, BD068 and BD087 are unsuitable areas to build houses being adjacent to a water treatment plant and the Biddulph Brook. In many respects this plan does not meet the Core Strategy of SMDC and SCC in meeting their own obligations stated in the Historical Environment Assessment Report which is to protect and retain the character of the landscape and follow and develop many of the recommendation therein. There is a finite limit to the availability of land on which to build houses and the limit to where the wellbeing and recreation of the population is detrimentally affected. The County's Historic Environment Assessment demonstrates that this area has historic value in terms of heritage and historic landscape character.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are "Site is located within the north of Biddulph, east of the dismantled railway line, and comprises an area of rough grassland and scrub. The site is enclosed by residential development to the south and west, and a sewage treatment works to the north-east, resulting in low visual prominence. Although the adjacent settlement edge is well-defined, it is urban in character to the south of the site. Existing vegetation on the north-eastern site boundaries would form a vegetated settlement edge, and therefore this vegetation should be retained and strengthened where necessary. Site is of low landscape sensitivity." • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO9006 regarding heritage impact.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9634	Mr R Lloyd				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Ecological interest on the site; An unofficial but heavily used path crosses the site; Loss of Green Belt; Width of access for emergency vehicles or multiple delivery vehicles; adequate parking for average number of cars per household; mature trees screen the sewage works; human health - smells, rats; very difficult saturated drainage and surface water problems; increased traffic on Mow Lane; lack of jobs; and space requirements if the sewage works needs to expand	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4994 regarding site screening. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • Employment land is also proposed for allocation in Biddulph in the Local Plan.
PO9651 PO9652	Mrs Mary Berry Mr and Mrs A D Lawton				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Public health implications due to close proximity of sewage works (noise, odour, raw sewage flooding); Impact on wildlife; Loss of Green Belt; Flood Risk; Inadequate highways and emergency access - distributor road and feeder roads are not suitable and there is no scope for improvements to Mow Lane; and The local community has had unfettered community access to the site since the estate was built in 1971. The land should be designated as visual open space.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.
PO9579	Mrs C Cliff				Object	(Summary) Object to development of this site for the following reasons: Pollution due to odour from the nearby sewage works and noise pollution from the pumps; Health problems of residents in York Close may be linked to close proximity of sewage works; Collection chamber just off Essex Drive has overflowed and properties in Essex Drive have experienced flooding with raw sewage which has also entered Biddulph Brook; Road network leading to the site is inadequate - road safety concerns; Previous planning applications refused with one of the reasons being the highway network; Can be difficult to drive along York Close due to parked vehicles; and Loss of habitat in field - birds, badgers and foxes, marsh orchid. Needs a proper assessment. In 2015 some clearance work was undertaken on the site which could have disturbed wildlife.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology.
PO9688	Mrs P Hancock				Object	Access (Mow Lane) is too narrow.	See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO9958	Mr C Lunt				Object	Don't build here, it's greenbelt and being adjacent to the sewage works could cause health issues. The existing roads of Essex Drive and York Close aren't capable of taking further traffic, nor is the bottom end of Mow Lane.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9982	Mr Ray Lloyd				Object	(Summary) Object to this development for the following reasons. Little regard for existing rights of way width access for emergency vehicles adequate parking for households overhanging trees that screen the sewage works human and pet health aspects linked to smells, rats etc saturated drainage and surface water problems doubling of traffic activity on existing roads competition to find jobs to pay for the houses space requirements when the sewage works needs more land One of only 14 Green Belts in the UK.	• See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4994 regarding site screening. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO9634 regarding lack of employment.
PO10059	G B Ford				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: The distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy; The sewage works is working over capacity; Local residents already experience unacceptable amenity impacts (noise, odour, raw sewage flooding in periods of heavy rain); and SMDC Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded that the site is not recommended for potential development. I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.
PO9914	Mr W Lawton				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Public health and proximity to sewage works; Impact on habitats and biodiversity; Land is Green Belt; Flood risk; Highways and emergency access; and Unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way. I think that the site should be included as visual open space or public open space.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to Po4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.
PO10181	Rev Lindsay Clowes				Object	The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph. Adjacent residents already experience unacceptable amenity impacts (noise, odour, raw sewage flooding). In heavy rain, raw sewage floods and pollutes Biddulph Brook. Building housing closer will increase these impacts and increase statutory nuisance incidents. Contradicts Core Strategy Policy SD4 neither the distributor road nor the feeder roads meet SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. Roads are too narrow; pinch points (bridges). Mow Lane dangerous, no footpaths. No scope for the required improvements. local community have had unfettered access to this site since the estate was built. Over 40 years total open access to residents. Land should be designated as visual open space, protecting the ecology (wet meadow). Three public rights of way cross land.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to Po4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9951	Mr T Green				Object	Object to this site being allocated for housing and do not support its development for the following reasons: Summary below (see attached rep for full response) 1) Public Health - proximity to sewage works. Residents in this area already experience unacceptable amenity impacts and new housing will lead to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. 2) Habitats and biodiversity. 3) Green-belt and Flood risk. 4) Highways and Emergency access - the distributor road nor the feeder roads meet the minimum standards. 5) unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way - for over 40 years there has been total open access and the land has been used by local residents.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way.
PO10156	Mr N Clowes				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Council Phase I Habitat Survey concluded site is not recommended for potential development. Only site where this was concluded - other sites are more suitable. Contain UKBAP and Staffs BAP priority habitats and species. Development would contradict Section 40 of Natural Environment and Rural Communities, and Policies C3 and NE1 Core Strategy. Survey findings also refer to site being very well connected to other biodiverse habitats through hedgerow scrub... As the Council's (strategic) Green Infrastructure Strategy does not exist the above Phase I Habitat survey findings must be prioritised site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph, which is already working over its capacity limit. An increase in 885 houses will obviously require investment in this facility; will not be facilitated by numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites [CIL contributions]. adjacent residents already experience unacceptable amenity impacts (noise, odour, raw sewage flooding). During heavy rain sewage floods the system, pollutes Biddulph Brook. Residents repeatedly contacting United Utilities. building houses even closer to sewage works will increase these impacts (increase statutory nuisance incidents). Contradicts Core Strat Policy SD4. currently green belt, should only be considered for release under exceptional circumstances (not demonstrated). Removing from green belt prioritises for development in the flood plain (in FZ2) (contrary Policy SD4). development will increase surface water runoff this site experiences..reducing time lag into the Biddulph Brook. development will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to it as well as polluting Biddulph Brook.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2.
PO10000	Mrs C Cliffe				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Loss of Green Belt; Loss of wildlife and corridor links with Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way; Loss of sites function as floodplain; Sewage works is over capacity - existing problems with discharge of raw sewage during periods of heavy rain; Lack of adequate highway network to cope with the additional traffic - Mow Lane is narrow with no footpaths and no facility to create them. York Close and Essex Drive are both narrow with bends; Difficulties with emergency service access; Development is not sufficiently large enough to add a	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						measurable contribution to CIL; Medical and educational facilities in the town need to be able to cope with increased numbers; and Consider that site should be included as visual or public open space.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • The land cannot be allocated as public open space as it is privately owned.
PO9980	Mr D Cliffe				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Loss of Green Belt; Loss of wildlife and corridor links with Biddulph Brook and Biddulph Valley Way; Loss of sites function as floodplain; Sewage works is over capacity - existing problems with discharge of raw sewage during periods of heavy rain; Lack of adequate highway network to cope with the additional traffic - Mow Lane is narrow with no footpaths and no facility to create them. York Close and Essex Drive are both narrow with bends; and Consider that site should be included as visual or public open space.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4642 regarding flooding. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO10000 regarding public open space.
PO9755	Mr M Alcock				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Mow Lane is too narrow to accommodate extra traffic and there is no room to widen it; and Highway safety for pedestrians as there are no pavements. Public health and proximity to sewage works; Impact on habitats and biodiversity; Land is Green Belt; Flood risk; Highways and emergency access; Unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way; and Wise use of Community Infrastructure Levy. I think that the site should be included as visual open space or public open space.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO10000 regarding public open space.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10195	Mrs I Tranter				Object	In 1965 this land was declared by Council as no good for building on. It has been turned down since then also. Nothing has changed (if anything it's a lot worse). Question will Highways Department undertake work on Mow Lane to help make it safer for [school]children and [pedestrians] ie walkways, traffic calming humps. Mow Lane is already a rat run. Advises will personally undertake vehicle census between 8am-9:30am and 4pm-6:30pm. Will forward to SMDC/Highways Authority, and put online. Hopefully more housing may bring more to the town centre (eg police station, more medical services). None of this will be accomplished by putting into a very poor field with [all its] problems.	• Planning decisions are made using policy that exists at that time. Circumstances have changed since the 1960s. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO10000 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit.
PO10116	Mr R Meadowcroft				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Loss of Green Belt - no exceptional circumstances; There are other areas within Biddulph which are more suitable to build on where access will not be a problem, Mow Lane, Essex Drive and York Close do not meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways design guide policy; The site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the community infrastructure and will not benefit Gillow Heath; Close proximity of the sewerage works which already causes noise and odour (almost on a daily basis) and raw sewage flooding in York Drive, Essex Close, Long Valley Road, + Marsh Green Road; The SMDC local plan phase 1 habitat survey stated that this site is NOT RECOMMENDED for potential development – it is the only site surveyed where this was concluded; This land is used by the local community and there has been a total open access since the estate as built. This land should be designated as visual open space, protecting the ecology and allowing the wet meadow to do natural job of reducing flooding and water course by slowing the runoff. Three public rights of way cross this land. I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4985 regarding community benefit. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site. • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO10000 regarding public open space.
PO10290	Mr J Whitehurst				Object	Keep BD062 Green Belt an area for wildlife. The smell from the sewage works isn't good now, when it rains heavily the manhole cover comes off spilling sewage onto the field. Essex Drive and York Close are too narrow Mow Lane – Traffic already a nightmare.	• See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO10104	Mrs V Whiston				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Mow Lane is busy and dangerous with no footpaths; Access for emergency services; Sewage works next to the site - odours, leakages of sewage in some gardens, health hazard, cannot cope with further development; Site acts as a floodplain helping to slow down the water from the hills as it heads towards the brook; and Impact on wildlife and ecology. I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	• See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO10000 regarding public open space.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10194	Mr P Johnson				Object	Understand why revoking green belt status and giving planning permission for development have been refused in the past despite the sewage works being upgraded a few years ago there are still occasions when a strong odour is experienced several streets away. Issues of flooding and raw sewage leakage; site becomes very wet indeed in heavy rain. Additionally, Biddulph Valley Way water flow feeds into Brook. Track has become waterlogged. Eastern river liable to flood during heavy rainfall. [Water run off implications]. Question if projections have been conducted to assess whether the capacity of the sewage works is sufficient. Mow Lane and Marsh Green Road are very narrow. In places too narrow for vehicles to pass. No footpaths etc. Mow Lane is major transit route from Congleton to A34. Doubtful whether road system is suitable [now] without adding extra burden from potentially hundreds of extra vehicles [and resultant noise and air pollution]. [Would be more dangerous for pedestrians [parents, the elderly etc]]. Access to BD062 is restricted. Estate roads are narrow with steep gradients and sharp turns. Already on-street parking. Ambulances, fire vehicles, delivery lorries, waste vehicles would find their negotiation more difficult. Biddulph is a dormitory town with very limited work possibilities and facilities. Consequently a very large number of people have to commute to work/drop children off at school. All of this traffic would be funnelled into Mow Lane (no footpaths). Were some/all of sites: BD138A/064/004/138B/062/068/083/087 adopted, resultant pressure on infrastructure would be unimaginable. Area would be totally transformed,...large numbers of houses into relatively small area. Higher density living [without] the infrastructure to serve it. SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy somewhat inadequate. Phase I ecological survey stated that site not recommended for development. Quotes relevant excerpts from Green infrastructure Guidance on Natural England website. Owner felled most of trees on site. [Questions motives for this]. We are concerned development here would have detrimental effect on biodiversity of area, introduce much higher risk of flooding, put greater stress on water purification and sewage plant, put unacceptable pressure on the narrow roads and putting drivers and pedestrians under greater risk.	• See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO9634 regarding lack of employment. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO577 regarding Green Infrastructure Strategy.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10142	Mrs B Rowland				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: site shares a boundary with main Biddulph sewage plant (at design limit already) adjacent residents already experience unacceptable amenity impacts (noise, odour, raw sewage flooding). During heavy rain sewage floods the system, pollutes Biddulph Brook building houses even closer to sewage works will increase these impacts (increase statutory nuisance incidents). Contradicts Core Strat Policy SD4 currently green belt, should only be considered for release under exceptional circumstances (not demonstrated). Removing from green belt prioritises for development in the flood plain (in FZ2) (contrary Policy SD4). Neither the distributor road nor feeder roads meet the minimum standards for SCC highways design guide policy. Roads are narrow; two pinch points (bridges). Mow Lane dangerous with no footpath. No scope for required improvements.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO974 regarding highways.
PO9924	Mrs M Harding				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Public health and proximity to sewage works; Impact on habitats and biodiversity; Land is Green Belt; Flood risk; Highways and emergency access; and Unfettered Community Access and Public Rights of Way. I think that the site should be included as visual open space or public open space.	• See response to PO577 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. • See response to PO577 regarding ecology. • See response to PO4635 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO4985 regarding exceptional circumstances for loss of GB. • See response to PO2704 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO974 regarding highways. • See response to PO4996 regarding public access to the site • See response to PO4989 regarding maintenance of link through site to Biddulph Valley Way. • See response to PO4992 regarding allocating the site as Visual Open Space. • See response to PO10000 regarding public open space.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9029	Seabridge Developments Limited		Mr Andy Williams		Support	We represent Seabridge Developments Limited which owns land north of York Close and Essex Drive, Gillow Heath, Biddulph that is identified as BD062 on the Site Options Consultation. Green Belt: Our client was previously represented by McDyre & Co who submitted representations on the Core Strategy and also gave evidence at the Examination in Public. You will have a copy of that representation on your file, but for the sake of completeness, another copy is attached. You will note that my client has consistently argued that there is a need to review the Green Belt to meet housing need in the Plan period and beyond and also that my client's land is ideally suited to contribute towards that need. The Council has acknowledged that it will be necessary to review the Green Belt to meet its housing needs, including around Biddulph. In this respect, we would draw your attention to paragraph 70 of the Inspectors Report on the Core Strategy when he stated: "A slightly different scenario is provided by suggestions for sites, such as that at Gillow Heath in the vicinity of Biddulph. Here, as I saw during my visits to the area, there are sites currently within the Green Belt designation which could form the basis for small urban extensions which Policy SS5b indicates [MM24] will be identified as part of a comprehensive review of the Green Belt around Biddulph through the Site Allocations DPD and review of the Core Strategy..." (emphasis added) As can be noted, having visited the Gillow Heath area, the Inspector gave a clear indication that my client's land would represent a potentially appropriate housing extension to the urban area. Green Belt The Green Belt Review Study (November 2015) has assessed the value of Site BD062 and the adjoining land to the east (BD068) in terms of the main purposes of Green Belt and has concluded as follows: · Check Sprawl – Limited Contribution · Maintain Separation – Limited Contribution · Prevent Encroachment – Limited Contribution · Preserve Setting – Contribution The Study concludes that the overall impact of developing these two sites on the Green Belt purposes is 'LIMITED' and that "these sites are connected though their enclosure to the north by Marsh Green Road. As such they are effectively part of the built envelope of Biddulph in this location and notwithstanding the presence of a sewage treatment works between the sites could be developed without impinging on the wider Green Belt either physically or visually." We concur with the findings of the Study and we suggest that its deletion will not harm the function of the Green Belt in the wider area. Deliverability and Potential Development Capacity: My client owns the site and the Registered Title extends up to the adopted highway at the end of York Close and Essex Drive. There are sewer easements over the land, but these can readily be accommodated within any future development on this relatively level site, which is also not affected by the more steeply sloping contours affecting land to the east. The site is available and achievable and we maintain that it is suitable to accommodate up to 40 dwellings, having regard to all known constraints including: the triangular shape of the site; existing sewer easements; the informal/non-statutory path that links from the southern boundary to the	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						footpath and housing to the west; strong boundary tree cover to the east; and the proximity of the sewage works to the north-east. Transportation We note that the Highway Authority has no objection to a development of up to 40 dwellings served off York Close, presumably in line with Manual for Streets, which of course, post-dates any earlier guidance and/or planning history that might be referred to in order to raise objection to this excellent housing site option. An initial Highways Report has been undertaken and is attached. The Report confirms that a proposed development of up to 40 dwellings can be achieved by safe means of access design that complies with the technical standards adopted by Staffordshire Moorlands and in accordance with Manual for Street Design guide. It also demonstrates that the traffic associated with a development of up to 40 dwellings, can safely be accommodated onto the local highway network. The existing peak time traffic flows currently operate well below their theoretical capacity, meaning that a development of up to 40 dwellings would have a very little impact on the local highway network and would not constitute severe impact to warrant refusal as stated in the NPPF. The site can be accessed by both walking and cycling and therefore provides alternative modes of transport opportunities to the car to access the local schools and amenities. There are also public transport services that operate from Congleton Road (A527) and the surrounding area within a very short walking distance of the proposed development. Overall it can be concluded that the site is very sustainable and offers a wide range of alternative modes of transport locally. The Report notes that the National Planning Policy Framework states that, "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe". It concludes that overall, the proposed development does not produce a residual cumulative impact on the road network and is considered acceptable in transport terms. The site is located in a sustainable location and would therefore deliver a highly sustainable small scale graft onto the existing urban area. In the circumstances, the proposed access, to serve the application site off York Close, the surrounding priority junctions and footway connectivity can safely accommodate all vehicular and pedestrian movements and so is rightly considered by the Highway Authority as a potentially acceptable allocation for residential use. Ecology: An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken in June 2014 and this confirmed that the site holds little ecological significance and any potential impacts arising from its future development can be minimised and enhancements to local biodiversity can be achieved through an Ecological Mitigation Strategy to be formulated in due course. The site has recently been re-surveyed and assessed and latest report completed this month (June 2016) and attached herewith, also confirms that: "The habitats on site provided limited potential for use by reptile species. Although suitable reptile habitat within the site is limited in extent, it is recommended that a precautionary approach is followed, with a method statement prepared	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						that details the actions required to reduce the risk to common reptiles (if present) being injured as a result of the works.” (§1.11) Flood Risk: The site is shown on the Environment Agency Flood Map as being Flood Zone 1 (e.g. not liable to flood). It is envisaged that the foul water will discharge into nearby mains and the surface water can either be to soakaways, or attenuated to discharge at an agreed green field run-off rate into the adjacent watercourse. Odour: An Odour Assessment has been undertaken and is attached. This confirms that the nearby Treatment Works have not generated objection and that all but the very northern tip of the site (which could be open space) is suitable for residential development. The findings of the report do not materially reduce the capacity of the site to accommodate between 35-40 dwellings. Conclusion: The site is of only ‘limited’ value in terms of fulfilling the purposes of Green Belt and it is clear that there are no physical (ownership, easement and topography) technical (highways and flood risk and drainage), or environmental (landscape, ecology, trees and proximity to the nearby treatment works) constraints to prevent the development of the site for up to 40 dwellings. In summary, this site is suitable, achievable and capable of delivering a sustainable modest scale of residential environment in keeping with the adjoining urban area and without detriment to the wider surroundings. In the circumstances, we fully endorse the site option BD062 which is immediately available and capable of delivering new homes at the earliest available opportunity.	
PO9871 PO8901 PO6875 PO6116 PO5713 PO7285 PO7249 PO5577 PO5556 PO5387 PO5519 PO5055 PO5792 PO4862	Mr Gayle Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr G Mason Mrs J Frisby Mrs D Whalley Mrs C Dale Mr A Weston Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw Mrs S Harper Mr N Moxon Ms Philippa Swindells Mr Stephen Clowes Mr Allan				Support	Support	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD062 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5006	Knapper Mr R Milner						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1315	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary) Within Biddulph we note site reference BD063a, this appears to be on the boundary of our area with Severn Trent Water for the provision of wastewater services. We would find it helpful to confirm that this site will discharge to that area served by United Utilities.	Points of discharge to the wastewater network are a detail which can be confirmed at a later stage in the process once the sites have been allocated in the Local Plan and detailed development schemes become available at the planning application stage.
PO2782	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The following comments highlight sites where we consider there may be issues relating to contaminated land BD063: According to information held by the Environment Agency, these sites are located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	It is considered that although this matter will require more detailed investigation if a detailed scheme is being developed, it is an additional development cost rather than an issue which would prevent development from taking place.
	Petition with 883 signatures				Object	We the undersigned call on Staffordshire Moorlands District council to discount/remove area BD063A Newpool Road, Knypersley from the Local Plan 2031 Preferred Option Sites. We believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council need to consider the following: - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) I. NPPF states that greenbelt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on unspoiled land to meet their housing target II. NPPF states that brown-field sites are to be prioritised over the development of greenfield and certainly greenbelt sites, but these plans offer up greenbelt in advance of brown-field site development III. NPPF states that merging of communities is to be prevented, yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph IV. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place, or are not time-lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare with these massive scale extensions of population - Impact on highway safety and traffic I. this section Newpool Road (BD063A) is already affected by high volumes of traffic flow at peak times and school hours. The bridge access at the bottom Newpool Road can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles i.e. buses and lorries attempt to cross over. The current access to site BD063A is via a single carriageway access road, which would not provide proper and safe access to a development of 40 houses, the access would need to be upgraded with the formation of a proper road junction and pavement area to allow for safe access and continued traffic flow, this would potentially mean the need to restructure the garden areas to 58 and 60 Newpool Road to allow for safe visibility splay for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site (the garden area of 58 Newpool Road goes straight out to the existing pavement area and would not allow for any room to create a safe visibility splay for cars or pedestrians). The adding of 40 houses on this area will cause increased traffic flow of over approx. 100 cars which will add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area.	- The land in question is within the Green Belt. The new Local Plan looks at development requirements to 2031. Biddulph's share is lower than Leek and Cheadle as it is recognised that the Green Belt acts as a constraint. In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. However, the Council's Green Belt Review highlights areas of the Green Belt around the town which could be considered for release without jeopardising the wider purposes of the Green Belt designation. This study recommends considering a smaller variant of site BD063a for release from the Green Belt but considers that other options to the west of Biddulph would be better. The capacity of the site has been reduced from 120 to 40 to reflect the results of the Green Belt Review. The Council has to balance the evidence base and consider the best way forward. - If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						3. Conservation of the natural environment: I. the above site is host to different species of bats, owls and huge array of wildlife that will perish as a result of the proposed development II. Site BD063A is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing which provide the community a meaningful way to connect with the natural environment 4. Effect on the landscape: I. the development of site BD063A which has an elevated incline with potential two & three storey properties would have a dominate and detrimental effect on the landscape, as the majority properties that currently boarder this site sit at a lower level and this will create overpowering effect on these properties with the loss of privacy. These fields are an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. Site BD063A provides views of the natural landscape and if developed on, this connection with the natural environment will be lost forever. I trust that you are able to understand the concerns of the people of Newpool Road and the possible destruction of Greenbelt land if any development was to be proposed on site BD063A. we are here to protect the environment and the destroying of more fields in particular 'GREENBELT AREAS' to new development and concrete will only have a major effect on us now and future generations. The correct way forward is by using existing allocated and brown-field site for development without the need to take away virgin sites and GREENBELT AREAS.	Local Plan. - The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependent on the sites selected to take forward. - The Highway Authority does not raise any objections to development of the site. - The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: This site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. - The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 3 which means that it is good to moderate. It is up to the Council to balance all the planning issues in determining whether to select a site for development in the Local Plan. - The Council's Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) concludes that the land is of low landscape sensitivity. - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO26	Mr Wayne Tracey				Object	Firstly why is this plot back in the Core strategy, it was removed some years ago due to objections and a personal visit by Sybil Ralphs. Also the named Councillor has stated the below in an interview with Leek Post and Times regarding the Greenbelt use: "Leader of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Sybil Ralphs, said this week she was totally against building on green belt land. She said: "No development should be allowed on greenfields when brownfield sites are available. "If any development impacts adversely on the quality of life for people who already live in areas proposed it should not go ahead." I put it to you that the Target of Housing required for Biddulph can be fulfilled using up the old Brownfield sites in the area. Taking the easy option of Greenbelt sites is morally wrong and constitutes the Guidelines set out By the Government. I would like to add some information from the "House of Commons library" with reference to Green Belt: "Government policy on protection for the green belt is set out in chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states that that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the green belt" Purpose of green belt land According to the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the green belt serves five purposes: • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.1 The CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England), describes green belts as a buffer between towns, and town and countryside whereby within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation encouraged. Also using the NPPF Document I would like you to note in section 9. It states the Green Belt should only be used in "Exceptional Circumstances" see below for the exert The NPPF also states that new green belts should only be established in " exceptional circumstances ": The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. It also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate" for the green belt, although there are exceptions: 89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: • buildings for agriculture and forestry; • provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; 3 Department for Communities and Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 Number 00934, 30 June 2015 6 • the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size	• A larger area was considered as a broad area for development as part of the Core Strategy but not included in the final version of the plan. The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review (published in 2015) in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering a smaller variant of site BD063a for release from the Green Belt but considers that other options would be better. The capacity of the site has been reduced from 120 to 40 to reflect the results of the Green Belt Review. • If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD063a. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward. • Further work has been undertaken by the owner's agent to demonstrate that the site can be suitably accessed in accordance with highway standards.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						of the original building; • the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; • limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or • limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. With reference to the above guidelines, I don't feel that any "exceptional Circumstances" have been met. I believe there are lots of other plots listed that would be a lot more suitable and have no impact on the surrounding areas, infrastructure, landscape etc Since receiving the information from yourselves, I took the liberty to speak to a Local Head Mistress at a school in Biddulph, she believes that before more houses are constructed a school should be built to cope with the current demand, and certainly a better road network, especially the ones around the site(s) mentioned above. Schools in biddulph are currently full and will be for the next 4-5 years, this is based on figures available to the school network, using births etc. I have some images of the roads around proposed site BD063a, these are images gathered by myself and a neighbour over the past 10 years, it clearly shows that the road network cannot cope with the current residents. The congestion at the local surrounding Schools during hour leaving and arrival times is total mayhem, and the rush hour times are just as bad, the images will be posted with this document to support my case. I strongly object to the proposal to any housing development on Green Belt sites in the country and especially the ones in question.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO67	Mrs Clare Tracey				Object	Firstly “Greenbelt Land is Protected” under many laws in this country, and should only be used as a last resorts, as there are many Brownfield sites available in the district and also Greenfield sites, I can see no lawful reason to use any of the proposed Greenbelt sites in the core strategy, particularly this one. Can the council provide any strategy or information showing the plans to use up current Brownfield sites in Biddulph before we start destroying the landscape. I personally think we are taking the easy option, I would like to see more effort from the council in way of producing residents information about Brownfield Sites use, similar to the efforts displayed with the altering of Brownfield Sites. A huge Review was commissioned and compiled by “Amec Foster Wheeler” Can we not commision a review into using up Brownfield Sites, and also perhaps another review in the houses built on the Uplands Mill site that are currently not selling? After moving into our new property 4 months ago we love the views and use the public right of way on a regular basis, this particular “public right of way” runs through BD063A. The proposed site is Filled with Nature/Wildlife and picturesque views, building 40 Houses on this Famers Field is morally wrong, this is why the site is GreenBelt to start with, to Prevent “Urban Sprawl”. Doing this is would destroy the landscape and the village, de value the neighbourhood. I would also like to point out that since moving into the property it is quite apparent that the road network around BD063a simply cannot cope with current traffic and volume, 1 car can pass over the small bridge on Newpool road, this is packed with Traffic during School Runs and Rush hour. Cars are left abandoned as the roads are too narrow for parking. Emergency Services even struggle when trying to cross the bridge, buses and Lorries are commonly stuck and reversing to allow one to pass. Also, the local schools are full, I have a 6 Year old in Knypersley First School and I have a relative who works in the school, the school is full and is planned to be full for 4-5 years. This is the same for most schools in Biddulph. Where are the influx of children that would come with all of these homes get educated? Perhaps the council should first improve the Infrastructure and possibly build another school to cope, before building 100’s of houses in an area already over populated and with a road network bursting with traffic. I have now noticed that in new plans that a first school is now proposed. In The winter of 2014 we purchased our home, paid a lot of money for it, and stretched ourselves to have our forever home, with unhindered views surrounded by “PROTECTED” Greenbelt, if this proposal happened the devaluation of about 30 Properties will happen, not to mention the congestion around the area. Could the council provide me a list of Protected Greenbelt plots that could possibly remain greenbelt in the Future? What is the point in having the law in place if in years to come you will simply change the status, it was given the greenbelt status for a very good and genuine reason. Suitable sites would be BD071 + BD071A + BD106 + BD156, these are better suited as the road can cope with volume of traffic as it lines the Bypass. I strongly object to the proposal to any housing development on Green Belt sites.	• See response to PO26 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 in relation to brownfield sites that have been considered in Biddulph. The Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has assessed more than 150 sites in and around Biddulph including brown field sites and these have been included as allocations where they are large enough (10+ units), suitable, available and deliverable. However, there is not enough brownfield land to meet the town’s requirements. • The new Local Plan looks at development requirements to 2031. Biddulph’s share is lower than Leek and Cheadle as it is recognised that the Green Belt acts as a constraint. However, the Council’s Green Belt Review highlights areas of the Green Belt around the town which could be considered for release without jeopardising the wider purposes of the Green Belt designation. • The Uplands Mill housing site has been taken into account in calculating Biddulph’s housing needs. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage. • The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of ‘Preferred’ allocation sites from wider sites, including ecological evidence: This site was subject to a Phase I ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for ‘local wildlife site’ (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. These studies set out evaluations of the sites followed by recommended further surveys/actions in the event of future development. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects ‘Preferred’ sites. • The Council’s Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) concludes that the land is of low landscape sensitivity. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • The Highway Authority does not raise any objections to development of the site. • See response to PO26 regarding education capacity. • It is agreed that BD071 + BD071A + BD106 + BD156 are suitable sites and they have been included in the plan.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO128 PO129	Mrs Debbie Rogers Mr Richard Rogers				Object	I wish to object to BD063a on grounds of the destruction of our greenbelt land. I strongly believe that the greenbelt should be preserved in all circumstances. This particular patch of greenbelt is home to many varied forms of wildlife, including - but not limited to, birds of prey, bats, foxes, and many species of birds. It also includes a busy public footpath which my family and I frequently enjoy. Changing the use of this beautiful greenbelt land will totally destroy the habitat of our wildlife and the ambience of what is currently a place of outstanding natural beauty! I appreciate that there is a need for new housing, but firmly believe that we should protect against urban sprawl and use brownfield sites before greenbelt. I also object to this proposal (BD063a) on grounds of accessibility. There is currently a single track dirt path with which to access the patch of land. This will not be sufficient for accessing an estate of 40+ houses. At the very minimum it would need a road where by two cars could comfortably pass simultaneously, and a footpath on either side. There is not room to do this currently - the current road access is only wide enough for one car, and as there are existing properties on either side. I also object on grounds of increased traffic flow. Newpool Road is already struggling with sheer volume of traffic. The lower part of Newpool Road (surrounding the bridge) is so heavily congested with stationery and parked vehicles that the road is reduced to a single lane. This problem is heightened during the school run periods when travelling through is hazardous to say the least. Building another 40 homes on the road will only add to this problem. There have been a number of instances where emergency vehicles have been unable to pass through over the bridge. It is also hazardous because cars are parked on both sides of the road. This means that children, travelling to school, are dashing out from behind parked cars to cross the road. This congestion is terrible at present, it cannot cope with additional traffic from this proposed housing estate. I also object to BD063a on grounds of infrastructure. If we build another 40+ homes on Newpool Road Greenbelt land, those homes will house families. Obviously the new families will need to send their children to schools in the area. All the schools are already full. I am aware of plans to build another primary school, but this does not meet the needs of middle and high school students. It is difficult enough to secure places for our children in local schools. This is a significant problem for existing residents, and one that I don't believe has been sufficiently addressed. This problem is echoed with the local doctors' surgeries. The existing surgeries (Biddulph Valley and Biddulph) can not cope with the number of patients it currently has, and it is nearly impossible to get an appointment, even for serious medical conditions. I sincerely believe that in today's busy society, families and individuals need to fight hard to keep open spaces of greenbelt, where our children can learn to appreciate the beauty of uncultivated nature.	• See response to PO26 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding public footpaths. • See responses to PO26 and PO67 regarding alternative brown field sites. • See response to PO26 and PO67 regarding site access and highways. • See response to PO26 regarding education capacity. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO250	Mr Thomas Faughnan				Object	Newpool Road is already a busy road with any access from this proposed site onto the brow of a hill and near to a dangerous bend. There are cars parked near to the bridge at school times, making this road single track and potentially obstructing emergency vehicles.	See response to PO67 regarding highways.
PO150	Mr Chris Smith				Object	Having just spent a beautiful weekend in the Staffordshire Moorlands i am outraged at the development plan to urbanise this area of outstanding beauty. We regularly take a ramble through the land designated for development - BD063a we are outraged at this, this particular stretch of land is greenbelt area and as such should be fiercely guarded. We are strong conservationists and abjectly object to the development of greenbelt. The overall impact on wildlife and the landscape would be unforgiveable. Please do not build on one of our favourite country rambles.	- See response to PO26 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO67 regarding ecology. - See response to PO67 regarding public footpaths. - See response to PO67 regarding landscape.
PO210	Mr Stephen Platt				Object	I object to the building proposal due to site access wild life disturbance and also the lack of infrastructure within the area there are numerous wild life that will be disturbed badgers , bats, and birds of prey.	- See response to PO67 regarding ecology. - See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure.
PO367	Ms Deborah Johnston				Object	The 40 houses proposal on this site is ludicrous. Newpool Road is a busy road with congestion around rush hour and school drop off and pick up. Adding an extra 40 houses on this site will mean that on average there will be very near 80 extra cars using this stretch of road, as most houses nowadays have at least 2 cars. Buses have a hard job with the traffic we have now when they try to get over the bridge and ensuring there is enough room for them to swing round on to Newpool Road, Access in and out of the proposed site is limited and will mean certain houses may be having to be compulsory purchased to ensure an adequate site entrance. As well as the impact on traffic, the local schools are full to capacity which means that any families within these 40 houses will have to send their children to either Leek or Stoke-on-Trent which means extra traffic again on the roads. As well as the schools there will be a impact on other services who will be expected to provide support for these families.	- See response to PO26 and PO67 regarding site access and highways. - See response to PO26 regarding education capacity. - See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1167	Mr F.B Biddulph				Object	It seems the SMDC have ignored the legitimate objection put forward by residents off Newpool road and Meadow side Knypersley Land that borders my property in Meadowside, prime pasture land producing as least 2 crops per year cattle grazing. With all the immigration which this government and the previous governments have encouraged, where have you all allowed for food security, 1000's of more mouths to feed, less productive farm land to grow food. It seems this has not been properly thought through. Perhaps with Leek you just stuck pins on a map. When local councillors make the comments that you, making the decisions, have not viewed all the sites and don't know where they are, hence my past point. It does seem that you have not taken into account the infrastructure of New pool Road and Meadowside, an old railway bridge on a bend, an accident black spot, a full to capacity primary school, major traffic problems so that parts of the day nothing moves. The Lyne side estate all use newpool road, common sense does not prevail. You are expecting that 40 plus houses that would mean at least those 80 adults to 10's of children, 40-60vehicles using this one small road common sense doesn't prevail. Perhaps some of you, esp Mrs Ralphs and her conservative colleague may remember David Cameron standing in front of an audience feb 2015 saying that new houses will be built on brown fields and not Green Belt 'That he stated is conservative way. How do you answer that encroaching on green belt? Do you realise that there used to be a small colliery owned by R Heath? That boards my property in fact it is in the deeds to property. To this day we drainage is problem we have water drainage As a closing thought why have you not taken in to account the old mills could be made into attractive apartments within the town, this has already been proposed by one of our local councillors. You may be assured we as biddulph people will fight you every step of the way to keep the green area.	• The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 3 which means that it is good to moderate. It is up to the Council to balance all the planning issues in determining whether to select a site for development in the Local Plan. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding education capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding the Green Belt Review. • The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. • Any drainage issues on the land could be resolved through new development. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills in Biddulph.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO714	Ms Ruth Rowland				Object	I object to the Newpool Road/Meadowside development site (BD063A) on the following grounds: Nature conservation Flood risk Infrastructure - schools Infrastructure - traffic and transport Landscape and tourism Amenity Scale of development Government policy 1.) The area is currently a haven to wildlife including protected species (owls and bats). 2.) This section of agricultural land is listed as one of the very few 'best areas' in North Staffs and Derbyshire. It should be preserved. (Agricultural lands classification map for the West Midlands): http://www.soilenvironservices.co.uk/agricultural-land-survey/?gclid=CjwKEAjwKPS6BRD2ioKR7K245jASIAD1ZqHOTbOEWqCk23nT-mOn7fQz33aidwUNHqh9PMhyvgQxoCSLnw_wcB 3.) Biddulph is deemed the 'Garden Town of Staffordshire'. The area should not be developing greenbelt land, but making the area more attractive to tourists, thereby boosting the economy. 4.) The proposed sight will increase noise pollution, air pollution, light pollution and visual pollution. 5) Ancient trees and hedgrows could be lost or damaged. 6.) There will be a loss of privacy, and loss of light to current residents. 7.) The council have not taken into account the current guideline for increased dwellings, which is now 43% of the 6000 originally proposed. 8.) Educational, health and dental provision is at full capacity and cannot support proposed increases in population. 9.) Knypersley First School is a few hundred yards away from the proposed site and there is already traffic congestion. Parking is at a premium, with the school run becoming increasingly dangerous to pedestrians and motorists alike. 10.) Full consideration has not been given to brownfield sites within Biddulph. 11.) Part of BD063a was the site of a Victorian mine and contains disused mine shafts. 12.) Suggested suitable employment sites are totally ill founded when unoccupied retail and commercial buildings remain in Biddulph and Brown Lees Industrial Estate. 13.) The narrow farm track would not provide a safe exit for vehicles using the proposed site. Several accidents have happened at the junction of Towerhill Road and Newpool Road. This development would exacerbate the problem. The proposed 120 dwellings could generate 150 to 200+ extra cars. 14.) Residential access to BD063A would be shared with Newpool Farm. Agricultural traffic, including cattle and hay- bearing trucks and tractors would make this unsuitable and further congested.	• See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • The Environment Agency has stated that the area is not affected by flooding. • See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO67 regarding Impact on landscape. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • The Council constantly monitors levels of new housing needed to achieve its target – more details can be found in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO1167 regarding mining legacy. • The Council is looking to meet the future employment land needs of the District in the period to 2031 – refer to its employment land assessment for further details.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO712 PO723	Mr Graham Mellor Mrs Gail Mellor				Object	The proposal to build on greenbelt land off Newpool Road (BD063A) would have an adverse impact on the immediate area which would significantly outweigh any benefits. The current lie of the ground allows water, through natural drainage, to percolate through the soil and thus disperse via natural means. If the area were to become "hard standing" then there would be little doubt that existing properties will be seriously affected by runoff water, after rain and/or snowstorms. The land falls away considerably towards the "tin bridge" area. Properties in this vicinity would be affected as well as being greatly overlooked by any buildings on the higher ground behind them. This problem currently affects other properties higher up the land. The proposal would exacerbate the situation decreasing the ability of standing water to percolate away. Access to the proposed site would mean an increase in vehicles using Newpool Road - a well-known and much used "rat run"/shortcut to avoid the main Tunstall Road and it's, monitored, speed restrictions and hold ups. There are no monitored speed restrictions on Newpool Road, which is quite obvious to residents living in the proximity. Man near miss accidents are observed, both for pedestrians and vehicles, on a daily basis. There is a blind spot at the junction with Lyneside Road which is proceeded a few yards up the road by a bend on the brow of a hill-where the site access is proposed. An increase of at least fifty additional vehicles plus delivery and collection vehicles along with a significant increase in pedestrians will surely increase the likelihood of more mayhem, to an already busy and unmonitored roadway on a hill, on a bend and at a blind spot. Common sense must prevail and make potential accident prevention paramount. The site proposed is an area of natural beauty and greenbelt. It consists of mature hedgerows and large trees on open farmland and is home to many species of wild life. It is accessible via public footpaths and is used by hikers, ramblers and locals alike. It is an amenity that cannot be replaced. It should be preserved for future generations. It appears that it is better planning to preserve brown field sites, such as the old Victoria Colliery, Childerplay and land purchased by the owners of the car wash on the A527, all available for building, than preserve our natural heritage. I question the need to have to object to this proposal - again. It is only a few years ago that this site was deemed unsuitable for development. Will I have to spend the rest of my years wondering when the next attack is due? As an aside I received confirmation, from yourselves, that you had received my objection on the last occasion but it does not appear on your records. Is there any reason for this? I am also aware of others who have experienced the same situation.	• See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding loss of public footpath. • See response to PO26 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO26 regarding why this area is being reconsidered. • Regarding comments made in response to the previous consultation, the data was published in a different format which did not include the names of everyone who objected, just a list of the issues raised in their objections and Council responses. Only the statutory bodies (e.g. Environment Agency) were named in the report and not private individuals.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO695	Dr P R Rowland				Object	The area already suffers from heavy traffic congestion on the A523/Newpool Road crossroads, especially at school drop off and pick up times. Safety of drivers and pedestrians will be compromised, especially schoolchildren attending Knypersley First School and Park Middle School (already heavily congested on school days.) Do these schools have the capacity to receive the influx of additional children, or, the ground and resources to be expanded? Access to this site is restricted; currently a farm track with houses each side. Biddulph/Knypersley is already lacking in facilities for outdoor sport or recreation. Again in keeping with government policies, the local authority should be engaged in positive, forward thinking, long term plans, to quote Government Planning Practice Guidance "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land." In short, I would like to think that we had intelligent and forward thinking developers, re-using brown sites and utilizing unspoilt resources in constructive and not destructive manner, and that Biddulph/Knypersley would continue to be attractive and distinctive place to live, rather than just another androgynous town.	• See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • A Public Open Space review is underway. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO26 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road.
PO785	Mrs Anne Barnsley				Object	I wish to object to the proposed BD063A site Newpool Road/Meadowside – this area is Green Belt land and is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing. The road infrastructure cannot currently deal with the volume of traffic using Newpool Road – this is already a busy road used by drivers avoiding the speed cameras on Tunstall Road, the speed humps on Lyneside Road and is the main route through to Mow Cop and Brown Lees. The "tin bridge" is narrow and a severe hazard and can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles ie. buses, lorries, tractors attempt to cross over. More importantly this hazard also affects the Emergency Services! During rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars on both sides of the road (and on adjoining roads – Meadowside and Lyneside Road) exacerbate the situation and result in traffic chaos. The proposed access to site BD063A is on a dangerous bend and the brow of a hill on Newpool Road; this raises major concerns regarding safe visibility for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site. The addition of 40 houses on this proposed site will cause increased traffic flow of approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area. Knypersley First School (located at the junction of Tunstall Road/Newpool Road) is currently full to capacity and projected to be so for the next 4-5 years; this also applies to other schools in the area. In addition, local Doctors/Dentists have no capacity to accommodate new patients. The site has an abundance of wildlife and picturesque views, the building proposal is immoral, the site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green	• See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO26 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the Council's plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population. Government policy is that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of Greenfield and certainly Green Belt sites – the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to Biddulph town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years - many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. Biddulph and the neighbouring areas are a lovely part of the Staffordshire Moorlands and as such should be protected. I am of the firm belief that a stop should be put to this proposed development and any destruction of Green Belt land. Site BD117 - Situated on the A527 on the outskirts of the town - this site has currently been identified as a "Potential Suitable Employment Site". However, in view of the fact that there are vacant units, plus scope for expansion on the Victoria Business Park, I feel that this site is more ideally suited for consideration as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site". In addition, I would also suggest that land on the left-hand side (from the A527) of Childerplay Road is also considered as a "Potentially Suitable Housing Site".	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO806 PO814	Mrs Sue Ward Mr Arthur Ward				Object	A. I wish to raise my objections to the Newpool Road/Meadowside site (BD063A). I feel that the plans presented by the Council are greatly flawed for the following reasons Shouldn't domiciliary increases be viewed from a Staffordshire county perspective when so many factories & Pot Banks lie derelict within the Stoke-on-Trent area and other large towns? The Council haven't produced any plans for any increase in educational, health, dental or utility provisions. All the areas are at full capacity and cannot withstand the proposed increases in population within this area. Full consideration has not been given to brownfield sites within Biddulph - the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to the town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years – many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. The suggested suitable employment sites seem totally ill founded when within this area we have unoccupied retail and commercial buildings within Biddulph, in addition to vacant land within the Brown Lees Industrial Estate. Has any consideration been given to the use of some of the Open spaces for housing and replace that Open Space from Greenbelt land? B. I totally support all the objections for the use of Greenbelt land for some of these sites. The use of BD117, BD76A and BD76 for housing would provide the majority of land for the area's housing based on point A1 above. C. Having lived on Newpool Road for over 20 years and have first-hand knowledge of the points below. My main objection is to BD063A proposal of 40 dwellings for the following geographical reasons:- 1. Currently the only access to this site is a single-farm-track with a bungalow one side of it and a house the other. Even with the removal of the thick hedge it would be a very narrow two-way road. 2. This entrance is immediately after a bend at the brow of a hill making it a very dangerous exit onto Newpool Road at any time of the day. People use Newpool Road to avoid the speed camera on Tunstall Road and the speed humps on Lyneside Road. 3. The proposed 40 new dwelling will probably generate between 60 to 110 extra vehicles using Newpool Road which is not and never has been a road for major traffic. The Lyneside Road and the Brown Lees developments had a serious effect on the current traffic problems but this development proposal ensures dangerous traffic with potential fatalities. 4. The "old railway bridge" area which lies between the school and the proposed site BD63a access is narrow & virtually impossible to negotiate around school times and rush hour especially for emergency vehicles, buses or any delivery lorry. It is not unusual to see one or other of them stuck and reversing to allow other to pass. 5. Knypersley First School is just 1/4 mile away from this proposed site, next to the 'traffic light controlled' crossroads with A527, Tunstall Road. Currently during rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars are on both sides of the road (and on the adjoining roads of Meadowside and	• National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the District's housing requirement is met. Stoke has their own housing requirement. The County Council has no jurisdiction to set housing targets in planning law. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding reviewing the availability of brown field sites. • Open space needs to be accessible to local communities so developing it and replacing it outside the town in the green belt is not considered to be a satisfactory approach in planning policy. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO714 regarding use of BD117 for employment.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Lynside) exacerbate the situation and result in total traffic chaos. D. The site has an abundance of wildlife and picturesque views, the building proposal is immoral, the site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on - there is nothing exceptional about the Council's plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Greenbelt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population.	
PO830	Mr Matt Gibson				Object	I would like to object to the proposed development of site BD063A on the grounds that there is insufficient infrastructure in the surrounding area to support an increase in population, this includes but is not limited to roads, Newpool Road is already dangerous and over utilised with blind bends and congestion at all times of day; there would appear to be little scope to improve this. Schools - all local schools are already full which would force any new residents to travel in order to take there children to school, this would increase the burden on the already crowded roads. Health Services - given the issues currently experienced by those in the area attempting to get doctors appointments additional residents would only make this worse.	• See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity.
PO10278	Cllr Chris Wood				Object	I object to a number of the sites in the site options , and as a ward councillor for Biddulph west I will deal with those . Firstly the site number BD063a at Newpool Road is completely unsuitable in terms of the infrastructure in the area will not cope with any increase in number of vehicles that will have to access this site , the site itself is in green belt and doesn't lend it self to sustain housing in fact the councils own document states that it is an illogical site with no clear external boundaries to prevent incursion into the open countryside to the west of Biddulph leading up to Mow Cop and on the site appraisals it states there are better options in Biddulph and it is my belief this site completely contradicts the green belt review recommendations and the recommendation to the green belt review was not to pursue this site , the access is off an unmade road which has limited access and is totally unsuitable .	• See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • The Council's Green Belt Review assesses a larger version of the site than is included on the consultation map and describes this larger site as 'illogical'. However, the smaller variant (included on the map) "might be acceptable, but there are better options to the west of Biddulph". It is not agreed that the Green Belt Review recommends not pursuing this part of the site. The Council has to balance the evidence base and consider the best way forward.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO866	Ms Norma Gibson				Object	This site is totally unsuitable for housing. Not only is it home to numerous amounts of wildlife, it is on an already very busy and dangerous road. Schools in the vicinity are full. Even if additional schools are built, families will have to travel further to enable them to use a "local" school due to the criteria that applicants have to meet. The site is accessible via a single dirt track and the area is prone to flooding. Mine shafts are present in the location and building here will have a detrimental effect on the housing already in situ due to lack of privacy. This site should be discounted from the proposed sites, without hesitation.	• See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO714 regarding flooding. • See response to PO1167 regarding mining legacy. • See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity.
PO861	Miss Keelie Mellor				Object	I object to the proposed housing allocation site BD063a. Most importantly; this is green belt land and is working agricultural land. Building on this site does NOT agree with the NPPF. The NPPF also states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of greenbelt sites yet development on this site would be against what the policy states. Newpool Road is not suitable for 80+ additional vehicles. The tin bridge is precarious at the best of times; when larger vehicles are using the road (which is frequently), it is impassable by more than one vehicle. Emergency services have been delayed when attending to calls due to this. There is already flooding in this vicinity - additional housing will make this much worse. Due to the layout of the road, pedestrians are already at risk; blind bends and speeding vehicles do not mix well. The access path to site BD063a sits on the brow of a hill. It is already difficult to negotiate joining this busy road from properties already in situ. There is a complete lack of school places for additional families in this area. There are also mineshafts on this site. Building here could potentially put the homes that are already built, at risk. I am certain that if this site were approved for building, it would be just the start of a larger development and would open up the flood gates for further fields to Newpool Road to be earmarked for housing in the future.	• See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO714 regarding flooding. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO1167 regarding mining legacy.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO948 PO954	Mr John Hancock Mrs Alwyn Hancock				Object	I wish to raise my objections to the proposed BD063A site Newpool Road/Meadowside – this area is Green Belt land and is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing. The road infrastructure cannot currently deal with the volume of traffic using Newpool Road – this is already a busy road used by drivers avoiding the speed cameras on Tunstall Road, the speed humps on Lyneside Road and is the main route through to Mow Cop and Brown Lees. The “tin bridge” is narrow and a severe hazard and can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles ie. buses, lorries, tractors attempt to cross over. More importantly this hazard also affects the Emergency Services! During rush hour and pick up/drop off times at Knypersley First School parked cars on both sides of the road (and on adjoining roads – Meadowside and Lyneside Road) exacerbate the situation and result in traffic chaos. The proposed access to site BD063A is on a dangerous bend and the brow of a hill on Newpool Road; this raises major concerns regarding safe visibility for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site. The addition of 40 houses on this proposed site will cause increased traffic flow of approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area. The site is Green Belt land - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states : that Green Belt land is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the Council’s plans to build on unspoilt land to meet their current housing target. that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly Green Belt sites - these plans offer up Green Belt in advance of Brownfield site development. that merging of communities is to be prevented - yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. that infrastructure must come first - yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place or are not time lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare within these massive scale extensions of population. Government policy is that Brownfield sites are to be prioritised over the development of Greenfield and certainly Green Belt sites – the derelict mill on Station Road is not included in the current Option Site Allocations but is an absolute eyesore and long overdue for demolition. This is a desirable site perfect for the construction of apartments and ideally located being close to Biddulph town centre. Also the area bordered by Cross Street, Stringer Street and Walley Street is in need of comprehensive redevelopment and has been a blot on the town centre for years - many of the buildings are of no architectural merit and should have been demolished years ago to make way for modern living/work units. Biddulph and the neighbouring areas are a lovely part of the Staffordshire Moorlands and as such should be protected. A stop should be put to this proposed development and any destruction of Green Belt land.	• See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO714 regarding flooding. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO1167 regarding mining legacy.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1055	Mr David Kirkham				Object	I object strongly to the building of houses on greenfield sites when there are plenty of brown field sites available in this area. The BD063a site has many problems. The first being the entrance and exit from this site is narrow and has poor visibility on the right exit. The left exit is on the brow of a hill making exiting very difficult. Lower down Newpool Road we have a narrow bridge to negotiate which is an absolute nightmare at both school and work times of the day. There is an additional problem with parking on either side of the road at the school which adds extra pressure on the already busy junction. This is an already busy road which is used as a short cut. The entrance to this site also has a bus stop each side of the road causing another problem. So, 40 houses, possible 80 vehicles added to an existing busy road (A NIGHTMARE).	• See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding highways.
PO4639	Mr Eric Ball				Object	I find myself in the situation again where I am having to object to build house on Newpool Road, Knypersley – your ref no: BD063A. This proposed is very much ridiculous. Some of my objections are outlines below. Additional noise that would put on Newpool Road would cause me great distress. I have lived in my house for many many years. I am off limited sight and the great sounds of the wildlife that I hear, in the area behind my property, is of great comfort to me. There is a host of wildlife which will be destroyed if this land were to be built on including nesting bats, foxes and birds of prey. My property is next the access on Newpool Farm (Cookies Farm) and goes past my kitchen door. This is a single dirt track, completely unsuitable for access to 40+ houses. The track comes up to my property boundary. It is also a public footpath that is often used by rambler's and dog walkers. I don't believe that the interests of these people are being taken into account. Newpool Road is already a very busy road. The additional vehicles noise that would come from that would come from that building more houses here would be detrimental to my health. The road is not suitable due to precarious 'tin bridge' which only allows for single use when larger vehicles are using the road. The road is 30 mph that they should be. Development of this land does not agree with central government policy to protect Green Belt land (NPPF). The development of this land will lose the individual identities of Knypersley and Biddulph – again the central government states that the merging of communities is to be prevented (NPPF). 40 houses now will give the green light for further houses to be built in this area; this will extend up to the top of Newpool Road creating urban sprawl. I would be obliged if you could take these points into consideration when reviewing the proposals and suggest that this site BD063A is removed as a possible site for housing.	• See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding loss of public footpath. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4640	Mr Barry Aldridge				Object	I am writing to object to build houses on Newpool Road, Knypersley your ref: BD063A. As an older resident, the additional noise that this would put on Newpool Road would cause me great distress. I often sit in the garden when the weather is fine and take in views of the wildlife. The property I live in is next to the current access road to Newpool Farm which from what I understand, one of the proposed housing. In case you don't know, this is a dirt track and in no way suitable as access for housing. In case you don't know, the dirt track is no way suitable for access to houses. It is also a footpath that is often used by ramblers and dog walkers. Newpool Road is a very busy road. Emergency vehicles already struggle and more often than not have to put there sirens on. As a non-driver, I often have to use public transport. From my trips on the buses, I can tell you 1 st hand the 'tin bridge' at the bottom of the road is unsuitable for even more traffic. The site is Green Belt land should be protected. The NPFF states the Green Belt land should be protected, yet here you want to build houses on it. Why? There are more suitable sites for example Childerplay Lane. I would be obliged if you could take these points into consideration when reviewing this proposal. Building on this site does not make sense – I would suggest that it is removed from your site options.	• See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding loss of public footpath. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO26 regarding Childerplay Road.
PO4874 PO5068 PO5452 PO6178 PO5013 PO4907 PO6548 PO6996 PO8313 PO7358 PO8826 PO8619 PO7697 PO8072 PO10187 PO10120 PO10150	Mr Allan Knapper Ms Philippa Swindells Ms Diane Copeland Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr R Milner Mr B Barcoft Mrs Ann James Mr R Lawton Mr A Hague Mr E Hilditch Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch Mrs M Booth Mr J Shelly Mrs V Jackson Rev Lindsay Clowes Mr R Meadowcroft Mrs B Rowland				Object	Object.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4691	Mr D Goodwin				Object	There is no evidence that Biddulph actually needs to the amount of housing that is proposed in the plan. Also the infrastructure i.e. schools and Dr's are not there to support the extra population.	- The 20% figure – Biddulph's share of the District housing requirement - is set out in the Council's Core Strategy, a planning document which has been through consultation and an examination by an independent inspector. - See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. - See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity.
PO4614	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	BD063a - Major concern with traffic issues which need to be addressed before any development, not recommended for inclusion.	- See response to PO26 regarding access to site. - See response to PO67 regarding highways.
PO6692	Mr David Gibson				Object	I write in connection with the above proposal for potentially suitable site for housing. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location. Newpool Road represents the border of Biddulph and Knypersley marking a distinct boundary between the town of Biddulph and the Cheshire Plains. The continual spread of the town would severely impact this boundary and the welfare of those living in Newpool Road both visually and reduce quality of life through increased noise and the risk of accident on an already busy, dangerous road. The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: it is on a greenfield site, as well as being in the Green Belt, used by a local farm for grazing and feed production and also has a public footpath through used this year, as well as previously, by high school students training for their Duke of Edinburgh award, and building here would both diminish the striking view across the Cheshire Plains and deter ramblers from visiting the area. While issues with access and infrastructure could be resolved with significant investment deterring tourists from an otherwise redundant town would be highly ill advised. In addition to the above issues I also feel that this site is not suitable because the strain it would put on local NHS services. It would have significant impact for residents of Biddulph and surrounding areas. Having dispersed Ambulance services, local paramedics are already under significant strain; along with issues getting appointments at local doctors which is currently difficult, people would be at significant risk by the increased population.	- See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. - See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity. - See response to PO67 regarding highways. - See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. - See response to PO67 regarding loss of public footpath. - See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6600	Mr Adrian Hill				Object	(Summary) I would like to object and call on Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to discount/remove area BD063A Newpool Road, Knypersley from the Local Plan. The proposal is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base: No exceptional circumstances for building on this Green Belt land as required by NPPF. NPPF requires brownfield sites to be prioritised over green field sites. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first - currently no plans to develop new healthcare and schools with these massive scale extensions of population. Highway Issues - Inadequate site access, existing high volumes of traffic, highway safety - nearby school, inadequate bridge on Newpool Road. Natural environment & landscape - land is host to various different species of bats, owls and a huge array of wildlife. Land is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing which provide the community a meaningful way to connect with the natural environment. The geography of Site BD063A has an elevated incline and with potential development of two & three storey properties would have a dominant and detrimental effect on the landscape, as the majority of properties that currently border this area (particularly along Meadowside) are bungalow properties and sit at a lower level and this will create an overpowering effect to these properties with the loss of privacy. These fields are an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. Should make use of brown field sites instead.	• See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding Impact on landscape. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity.
PO7238	Kyle Mellor				Object	1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): I. NPPF states that greenbelt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is nothing exceptional about the council's plans to build on unspoiled land to meet their current housing target. II. NPPF states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and certainly greenbelt sites, but these plans offer up greenbelt in advance of brown field site development. III. NPPF states that merging of communities is to be prevented, yet development of site BD063A will lose the individual identities currently held between Knypersley and Biddulph. IV. NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the outline ideas to provide infrastructure are either not in place, or are not time-lined in advance of the proposed developments. There are currently no plans to develop new healthcare with these massive scale extensions of population. 2. Impact on highway safety and traffic: I. This section of Newpool Road (BD063A) is already affected by high volumes of traffic flow at peak times and school hours. The bridge access at the bottom of Newpool Road can only allow for single vehicle crossing when large vehicles i.e. buses & lorries attempt to cross over. The current access to site BD063A is via a single carriageway access road, which would not provide proper and safe access to a development of 40 houses the access would need to be upgraded with the formation of a proper road junction and pavement area to allow for safe access and continued traffic flow, this would potentially mean the need to restructure the garden areas to 58 and 60 Newpool Road to allow for a safe visibility splay for both cars and pedestrians exiting and entering the proposed site. The adding of forty houses on this area will cause increased	• See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding Impact on landscape. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						traffic flow of over approximately 100 cars which will only add to the existing traffic problems within this overburdened area. 3. Conservation of the natural environment: I. The above site is host to different species of bats, owls and a huge array of wildlife that will perish as a result of the proposed development. II. Site BD063A is used as working agricultural land that produces at least two crops a year, it is also in use for cattle grazing which provide the community a meaningful way to connect with the natural environment. 4. Effect on the landscape: I. The development of Site BD063A which has an elevated incline with potential two & three storey properties would have a dominate and detrimental effect on the landscape, as the majority of properties that currently boarder this site sit at a lower level and this will create an overpowering effect to these properties with the loss of privacy. These fields are an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. Site BD063A provides views of the natural landscape and if developed on, this connection with the natural environment will be lost forever. 5. Schools The middle schools in Biddulph are already at capacity. I do not see how there will be sufficient places at middle schools by constructing housing at the levels that you are proposing. I trust that you are able to understand the above concerns and the possible destruction of Greenbelt land if any development was to be proposed on site BD063A. The correct way forward is by using existing allocated areas and brownfield site for development without the need to take away virgin sites and greenbelt areas. It genuinely feels that SMDC are prioritising the profitability of development companies by offering up greenbelt land which would be cheaper to develop than other brownfield or urban alternatives. Please demonstrate that this is not the case by removing this site and other greenbelt sites from your future proposals.	
PO7379	Mr Nigel Yates				Object	Newpool Road is a small constrained site that has a dry stream valley running diagonally through it towards existing housing, the position of the housing would make the creation of a land drain difficult, and this area (including the existing properties rear gardens) floods during periods of heavy rain. Access to the development is via Newpool Rd, residents are deeply concerned about the ability of the very narrow Newpool Road bridge being able to take additional traffic load.	• See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site.
PO9047	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				Object	(Agent - G. Willard) Object to inclusion of this site.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9034	The Hart Family				Object	Rob Duncan (agent) This site has been identified as a preferred option, despite the Local Authority's Green Belt Review concluding that it makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt in terms of maintaining separation, preventing encroachment and preserving the setting of historic towns. It also makes a contribution in terms of checking sprawl. This analysis reflects the conclusions reached for my client's site, but for the reasons set out in Section 3 above, I submit that the Green Belt Review is flawed in terms of its assessment of my client's sites as it contradicts the Green Belt Review's findings for the wider parcel of land within which they sit. My client's sites are accordingly considered to represent a more favourable housing site option than this site, and as such I would request that the Local Authority abandons this site as a preferred option.	See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review.
PO9697	Mrs C Hill				Object	(Summary) Object to development of the site for the following reasons: Contrary to NPPF (protecting greenbelt, brownfield prioritisation, infrastructure first); Highway safety and traffic - Newpool Road bridge could not cope, inadequate site access - to correct this would need to use land from neighbouring properties); Impact on wildlife; Loss of agricultural land; Loss of trees and hedgerows; and Detrimental impact on landscape - rising land - also impact on amenity of existing residents.	• See response to PO26 regarding exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Development. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding Impact on landscape. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO714 regarding residential amenity.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO133	Mrs Clare Vause				Object	I strongly object to the proposed Newpool Road housing development BD063A I do believe there are better more accessible areas around Biddulph that can be used to build 40 houses on - I do not believe that these areas have been considered. The proposed development is on greenbelt land - farm land. George Osbourne has stated 'we will not be using greenbelt to build houses when other better options are available'. I believe there are better options available. There is a large amount of brownfield sites around Biddulph, it is of my opinion that these sites have not been looked at. The brownfield sites would be a much more suitable choice. It is of my opinion that the proposed 40 house site would be much better built closer to town with its amenities and better road network than tucked up behind a well established semi rural area in the middle of nowhere. The proposed housing development is in an area of natural beauty. It will disturb the local wildlife which include badgers, hares/rabbits, frogs owls and bats, not to mention all of the birds that come to the area. It will also destroy hedgerows and the wildlife within. The area is renowned with walkers/hikers because of the natural beauty and wildlife. Ripping the land to bits will destroy the wildlife, the scenery and landscape. Greenbelt lands needs to be protected! There is a great deal of traffic on Newpool Road already with people using it as a rat run. There is also a first school at the bottom of the road which adds to the traffic/parking problems. Building an additional 40 properties in the area will just add to these problems. There has been an identified issue raised with the amount of traffic on the road and the speed travelled as we have local a local speedwatch group that monitor the problem in cooperation with the local Police. Parking around the school is a big issue. The narrow bridge at the bottom of the road does cause a lot of problems with buses / tractors/lorries up and down. The proposed entrance road to the site is currently a farm track between two bungalows on the brow of a hill. How is this going to be turned into an access road without taking land from the bungalows - how is this fair to the current home owners? Also, with it being on the brow of a hill its an accident waiting to happen. I strongly object to this proposal.	• See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding loss of public footpath. • See response to PO67 regarding Impact on landscape. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site.
PO464	Mr Alan Nixon				Object	I do not believe that the housing plan is supported by housing demand or need and therefore development of green belt on this or any other extension of the boundary in Biddulph cannot be justified. The road network, drainage and services are inadequate to the site and the natural restrictions of the road layout, topography, adjacent bridge and nearby school/traffic lights make it impossible to improve at a sensible cost to permit viable development.	• The 20% figure – Biddulph's share of the District housing requirement - is set out in the Council's Core Strategy, a planning document which has been through consultation and an examination by an independent inspector. • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO1167 regarding drainage. • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity.
PO4677	Mr & Mrs I Sanders				Object	The access to this land if of Newpool Road between no 58 and 60. This is on crest of the hill and is on a slow bend. As far as I can tell it is the only possible access to the site. The land runs down in an easterly direction and is very wet at the lowest part. As it is farm land the water is spread over a large area. If this land is used for building on and covered in hard water go? My property is on the lower end of this land and we have no problems with water/flooding. Again as the land slopes away from the access area how the	• See response to PO26 regarding access to site. • See response to PO1167 regarding drainage • See response to PO714 regarding flooding • See response to PO1167 regarding mining legacy • See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding Green Belt Review. • See response to PO1167 regarding loss of agricultural land.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						sewage is removed. Can it be guaranteed that my property will be safe from flooding. This land has pits on it. Will these be dealt with in an appropriate manner? What records are there of previous mine workings on the land? Newpool Road leaves the A527 at Knypersley Cross Roads and travels in a westerly direction crossing over a narrow bridge. This bridge was built for horse and carts. We now have 35 tonne articulated lorry's and vehicles and buses. These vehicles very often block the bridge and cause delays for emergency vehicles. Many of the residents have two cars that are parked on the road as they have no off road parking. This restricts the road for other users. At school time the road comes to a halt because parents bringing their children to school and parking anywhere. There is a lot of speeding/dangerous driving that takes place on this road. The more Green Belt that is used for building the less there is for food production. This means that we have to import it increasing the carbon footprint and relying on foreign powers to supply us/ there is so many species of wild life, ancient hedges and trees that will be destroyed in the process. I am told that the local sewage works is already overloaded as it was designated for 17000 and at the last count there are 19500 + another 10000 a month from Biddulph Grange in the summer. After heavy rainfall the sewer in Newpool Road can't cope and get faeces washed up on my drive. This suggests to me that the sewers cannot cope. There is many more Brownfield site that can be used before valuable Green Belt is used. When the open casting took place on Victoria site at Brown Lees we were told that the reclaimed land would be used for industry recreation and housing as it will have better access to the A527. Also there is poor farm land on Childerplay Road that could be used again with better access to the A527. There are a number of old mills in Biddulph that could be used BD118 and BD109 are also a Brown Fields site. The infrastructure is far from adequate in this area and needs up grading. The schools are full along with the medical facilities.	• See response to PO67 regarding ecology. • See response to PO67 regarding brownfield land. • See response to PO26 regarding the mills. • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • See response to PO26 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road • See response to PO128 regarding infrastructure capacity. • See response to PO26 regarding Education capacity.
PO4675	Mr A Hill				Object	I would like to object to the allocation of the area (BD063A) Newpool Road Knypersley for the purpose of residential development under the local plan 2031 preferred options sites for the following reasons; The section of Newpool Road (BD063a) is already affected by high volumes of traffic at peak times and school hours. The access to site BD063a is a currently via a single carriageway access road, although there is an additional piece of land adjacent to the track it would still not provide a proper access to a residential development if 40 houses the access would need to be upgraded with a formation of a proper road junctions already on Newpool Road (e.g.: Road width 4.5m for development below 100 units and 1.8m wide pavements on both sides of the road) the need for visibility splay would also be required and based on the same road junctions already on Newpool Road (examples James Way, Henley Avenue and Birch Avenue) this would require the use of part of the garden areas of both numbers 58 and 60 Newpool Road (there would not be enough land to the front of number 60	• See response to PO67 regarding highways. • See response to PO26 regarding access to site.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD063a in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Newpool Road for visibility splay even without some of its garden area being used.	
PO6015 PO5041 PO6380 PO6327 PO8369 PO6223 PO7142 PO7450 PO8689 PO8709 PO7737 PO9659 PO9685 PO10003 PO10173 PO10082 PO10096 PO10162 PO10013 PO9990 PO10108 PO10039 PO10029 PO9868 PO10063	Mr P Price Mr G Boulton Mrs K Chaddock Ms S Wilson Mr and Mrs W Summerscales Mrs P Newton Mr A Atkinson Mr K Flannagan Mrs Joan Draisey Mr R Willott Mrs E Griffiths Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs P Hancock Mr Ray Lloyd Mr Robert Chambers Mrs Claire Meadowcroft Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding Mr N Clowes Mrs C Cliffe Mr D Cliffe Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt Mr Gayle G B Ford				Support	I support this site	Comment noted.
PO7582	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements.	Comment noted.
PO9267	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	We support the Preferred Housing Allocation reference BD063a and associated Green Belt Amendment.	Comment noted.
PO10050	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	Support development here, it would balance out the town and access from these sites is easily achievable. They are within walking distance of the town centre.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1311	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary) We wish to emphasise the need to carefully consider the allocation of new housing sites in close proximity to our wastewater treatment works. In this regard we note that our wastewater treatment works (WwTW) in your local authority include: Biddulph WwTW; Biddulph Park WwTW; and Flash WwTW. We wish to highlight that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. Therefore if you are considering any sites for new allocations, especially housing allocations, near to a wastewater treatment works, you should carefully consider the sites with your Environmental Health colleagues. This is important when comparing sites close to treatment works with potential alternative sites that may be available to you for allocation. This reflects our earlier correspondence to you. The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet housing needs, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites, which are sensitive receptors, that are not close to a wastewater treatment works. We note this point is particularly relevant to your assessment of sites considered for allocation in Biddulph as part of the current Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation. In particular, site references BDO68, BDO62 and BDO87, which are sited in close proximity to Biddulph Wastewater Treatment Works. Notwithstanding this preference, if it is still intended to progress with the allocation of sites near to a wastewater treatment works for housing following discussions with your Environmental Health colleagues, we strongly recommend that your decision should be informed by: 1. an odour impact assessment; and 2. a noise assessment. If after having undertaken these assessments you still allocate land near to the wastewater treatment works for housing, we recommend that there should be detailed associated policy which identifies the need for mitigating measures including any that may be identified as a result of the assessments. We recommend that: 3. careful masterplanning is always prudent in order to mitigate the risk of odour and noise nuisance. For example, any on-site open space should be located so as to act as a buffer between the treatment works and any newly introduced housing. In addition the houses could be orientated so to most appropriately manage the impact of noise; and 4. appropriate soft landscaping is included to strengthen the buffer between the treatment works and the proposed new development. With regards to site ref: BDO68, which lies immediately east of Biddulph wastewater treatment works, the consultation	Comments noted. Noise and odour assessments have been produced on behalf of the land owner and received by the Council very recently. Noise mitigation measures are recommended which could potentially be implemented as part of a development scheme – no odour mitigation measures are considered necessary. It is now up to the Council to balance the planning issues in determining whether to select this site for development in the Local Plan. Detailed associated policy for the site will be included in the Local Plan if it is selected and it is acknowledged that careful master planning of the site will be required including appropriate screening /buffering. Similarly, the recommendations above will be incorporated into policy should the site be taken forward. It is noted that United Utilities infrastructure is present on this site and if this site is selected as an allocation, a requirement will be included in the policy for this site requiring the developer to enter into early discussions with United Utilities on this matter.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						document indicates this could deliver approximately 70 new dwellings. We wish to highlight the presence of United Utilities' infrastructure at the site. This site is transected by a significant overground sewer running east to west through the site therefore we are flagging this as a constraint which needs further consideration. We wish to emphasise that United Utilities would require access and maintenance strips to its infrastructure to be retained. It is important to note that any developer of the site should not assume that the assets of United Utilities can be diverted, especially large assets like those within BDO68. Therefore if development is intended to take place in this location, we need to be consulted at an early stage to ensure our infrastructure is not compromised. We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible. We recommend this matter should be reflected in any detailed policy wording if you are minded to continue with the allocation of this site.	
PO2913	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to sites BD068 there is likely to be a requirement for junction improvement at Marsh Green Lane/A527; a transport assessment will be required to consider this.	Comment noted. A Transport Assessment can be undertaken at the appropriate time.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO155	Mrs Beverley Webb				Object	BD068 - Adjacent to Sewage Works – Western boundary of this site is Biddulph Brook which forms the Eastern boundary of the Sewage Works. Document produced by Defra - Code of Practice on Odour Nuisance from Sewage Treatment Works recommends very careful consideration of Planning Authorities allowing development adjacent to Sewage Works page 16 of this document is particularly relevant. As this documents states – because of the potential increased nuisance calls from a new adjacent development, this could increase all Biddulph residents’ water charges in order to offset the cost of upgrading the Sewage Works. Increased complaints to Environmental Health at SMDC, this could also impact on Council tax bills. The SMDC have a duty of care to protect residents from statutory odour nuisance. The working capacity of the Sewage Works is compromised following heavy downpours causing the sewage to overflow directly into Biddulph Brook and causing very powerful unpleasant smells. Also noise nuisance from the pumps working at high speed to cope with the ‘flooding’. This noise level is especially disturbing during evenings and throughout the nights. Complaint made directly to United Utilities on 29 th . April at 11.34am. In view of the above problem which is apparently caused by the design / construction of town sewer causing flooding in Gillow Heath and into Biddulph Brook - United Utilities say this cannot be solved without considerable funds, therefore it would sensible to maintain BD068 as a ‘cordon sanitaire’ (Buffer zone) between the sewage works and Portland Drive. Additional housing = additional problems = additional complaints to United Utilities and SMDC who have a duty of care to protect residents form odour/noise nuisance . SMDC Core Strategy SD Policy 4 states ‘ Pollution-sensitive developments should not be built next to polluting developments – page 108 refers. BD068 is also seen as a potential flood risk area from surface water according to the River Authority Map on website Environment Agency - GOV.UK . As a consequence of the building of new developments in Biddulph the issues mentioned above will increase. The current level of screening from a visual impact and noise from the sewage works can only be considered when the deciduous trees are in full leave. Building requirements for United Utilities are very specific regarding building over sewers. BD068 is probably riddled with old but still in use public sewer pipes which are probably not recorded by United Utilities given the age of some of the sewage system in Biddulph, and also a culverted watercourse therefore earth	• United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • Noise and odour assessments have been produced on behalf of the land owner and received by the Council recently. Noise mitigation measures are recommended which could potentially be implemented as part of a development scheme – no odour mitigation measures are considered necessary. • Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. • The site boundary can be amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site. • Screening of the sewage works would be required as part of any development on the site. • The landowner and United Utilities are aware of the public sewer pipes running underneath the site and any new development would need to enter into early discussions with United Utilities regarding their infrastructure. This requirement will be included in the site policy. • The Highway Authority considers that “the development of the site is acceptable subject to access design and visibility splays. Access is likely to need to be close to the bridge in order to meet visibility standards. Footway should be provided on the frontage to connect to the existing footway. Possible improvements to Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road junction. May be appropriate to realign Marsh Green Road to provide visibility to plot BD087 if possible and if agreement can be reached between owners”.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						moving vehicles could potentially fracture a hidden sewer pipe which would be an environmental disaster and a health risk. As Marsh Green Road is a single lane cutting with BD068 considerably higher than the road level access to the proposed development would have to be adjacent to the bridge over Biddulph Brook, therefore exiting the site turning east or west would turn into head on traffic as it is a single lane road in both directions. Also there is no footpath from Portland Drive going west. The road could not be widened to the required width of a feeder road complete with pavements to access BD068. Any development allowed on BD068 would severely impact on the Marsh Green Road/A527 junction which is already dangerously inadequate for the number of vehicles using Marsh Green Road which includes farm vehicles – tractors and trailers for example. Also Marsh Green Road is totally unsuitable for construction vehicles. The weight limit of the bridge over Biddulph Brook is unknown. Data provided by Staffordshire County Highways in October 2015 gave the following results for the A527:- Northbound direction shows that on an average day (24hrs) 7958 vehicles drive along Congleton Road. Of these 7958 vehicles the 85 th percentile speeds were 34.4mph. The peak of the volume was at 17:00 hrs with 601 vehicles travelling in this direction. Southbound direction shows that on an average day (24hrs) 7318 vehicles drive along Congleton Road. Of these 7138 vehicles the 85 th percentile speeds were 33.6 mph. The peak of the volume was at 17:00 hrs with 724 vehicles travelling in this direction. An average weekday peak hour two way traffic flow of 1325 vehicles. Obviously these figures will increase with additional development in Biddulph and there appears to be no planned road management improvements within the SMDC Local Plan.	
PO132	Mr Dave Boothroyd				Object	I do not believe that this is a suitable, or even possible area for housing development for the following reasons. 1: - Access. The area can only be reached by access along Mow Lane, which is very narrow, less than ten feet (3 metres) in width in places, with high banks on either side including protected mature trees. There are no footpaths on either side. 2: - Landscape and Geology. 3: - Flood Plain issues. There are powerful counter-indications against building on flood plains, highlighted by the major floods in parts of the country in recent years. The area is immediately adjacent to Biddulph Stream. When my wife and I moved to this area, our existing insurer declined our application because our postcode was flagged as an area at risk	• See response to PO155 regarding highways. • Landscape Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "Site is located within the north of Biddulph, south of Marshgreen Road. The site comprises fields enclosed by residential development to the north, east and south; and sewage treatment works to the west. The site is elevated above Marshgreen Road, however it is at a similar level to the adjacent residential development on Portland Drive, and has low visual prominence due to screening provided by the surrounding development and vegetation, particularly trees surrounding the sewage works. The site forms a gap in development, and therefore fits in well with the existing settlement

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						from flooding. Indeed, there have been floods on both Mow Lane and Congleton Road in the last twelve months. Every house insurer now asks prospective customers if they reside within 100 metres of a watercourse. Any owner or tenant of a house built on this area will have to answer "Yes" to that question. Any developer needs to face the same scrutiny by the Environment Agency with respect to building on the flood plain. 4: - The Sewage Works. Immediately adjacent to this area is the United Utilities' water treatment works. This would cause serious issues for any development on this area. The issues come under several headings. a. Visual aspects. A screen of trees hides the major part of the works from Portland Drive and Long Valley Road, in the summer at least. This is not the case in winter. Houses built on this area would have a clear and highly intrusive view of a huge steel structure of pipes, valves and pumps. Frequently vital work is carried out on this structure late into the night, using powerful floodlights. (Photographic evidence is available) b. Noise. Tanker lorries are used to remove waste materials from the works. On many occasions, installed heavy machinery (probably pumping equipment) is run late at night. Based on sound meter readings taken from Portland Drive, approximately 200 metres away, the noise level on a quiet night with the no machinery running was 46dB. On a different evening when the machinery was running the reading was 65dB. At 100 metres the sound pressure level, using the inverse square law, would be four times louder, that is 12dB more thus 77dB. At 50 metres the noise level would be 89dB, a further 12dB greater. Sustained noise levels of 90dB are a health hazard. As a reference the noise level in my very well insulated house, in conditions of silence, was measured as 20dB, which is the accepted level for "peace and quiet" in a house. 89dB in their gardens would be a statutory noise nuisance and would not be acceptable to residents of houses built on this area. c. Smell. The sedimentation tanks are all enclosed now, mostly because of serious complaints from residents of surrounding roads in the past. However, this has not completely solved the problem of the emission of foul smells. They do occur in Marsh Green, Portland Drive, Congleton Road, Mow Lane and Halls Road quite often (Three	form. Site is of low landscape sensitivity." ● See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. A planning application would still be needed before this (or any other) site could be developed and the Environment Agency is a statutory consultee. ● See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works. ● See response to PO132 and United Utilities (top of this table) in response to this consultation. ● In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD068 for release from the Green Belt. ● Education - The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward. ● Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. ● Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD068. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. ● The land to the north of Woodhouse Lane (west of the school) is not considered suitable for development, mainly due to the heritage impact on the nearby registered park and garden.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						times so far this year- most recently on Friday 6th May 2016) It would be a serious concern to anyone purchasing a house built only twenty metres away from the works, and could be a serious health hazard, from flies etc. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the following statement in a letter dated 26th May 2016:- “We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works.” 5: - The Green Belt, and infill between settlement areas. As recently as this month, senior government figures have emphasised the importance of the green belt in preserving communities in their areas. The original intention of "green belt" was to separate and delineate areas that have traditionally been separate. This area alone represents a clear, agricultural break between the former separate villages of Biddulph and Gillow Heath. If areas BD087, BD068, BD062, were all to be developed, a pair of semi-rural communities would be engulfed and lumped together in a densely populated suburb without green spaces. The green belt would be utterly destroyed in complete negation of both past and previous government policy. Is this what is meant by "infill"? I believe that "infill" is something to be avoided, according to the guidelines. 6: - Infrastructure. Any development on this site would fall into the present catchment areas of Ox Hey first school, Woodhouse Middle School and Biddulph High School. Each of these is operating currently at full capacity. None of the above schools have much opportunity for expansion. Prospective developers should be clear that they will need to provide the local authorities, or other providers with sufficient funds to create new schools, on new sites, within the next fifteen years, if proposed development targets are reached. Once again, taking all of the above proposed sites together, the resulting additional traffic using either the Marsh Green Road/ Congleton Road or the Hall's Road/Mow	National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke on Trent City Council has its own development needs to meet.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Lane/Congleton Road/ Smithy Lane Junction, neither of which is well served by visibility would be an extra level of hazard to junctions which are already dangerous. 7: - Amenity. Development on this site will result in a great loss of amenity for residents. People who bought their houses based on the assurance that the adjacent green space was green belt land forever, will be justified in, firstly opposing its inclusion in "sites suitable for development", and, should the development ever go ahead, in seeking redress for loss of amenity. Additional Site Options: - The map of proposed sites for Biddulph shows peripheral sites around most of the current boundary, with one exception. That is land to the north of Woodhouse Lane, west of the grounds of the school, and stretching from Woodhouse Lane to the boundary of Biddulph Grange and the Country Park. There is already development on this road, and the access would be from a relatively wide road. It is a large area with few houses that would be affected by the development. Based on a comparison of the area with the Uplands development, there would be room for up to 300 houses, allowing the Marsh Green and Gillow Heath developments to be removed. It is clear that there is a large area of properly restored, former mine working land on the site of the former Victoria Colliery to the south of Brown Lees Road, and a very large area of land on the east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph Allocation with very little impact on existing residents and ready access to the main road. The preamble to the document states that some authorities have been able to agree with adjacent areas that part of their housing allocation be transferred from one to the other. It goes on to say that both Cheshire East and Stoke on Trent have no surplus land that could be considered for use by Biddulph. This is completely counter to the glaring evidence that can be gathered from a drive of no more than a mile from the southern boundary of Biddulph. There are many hectares of land lying idle and crying out for redevelopment at Chatterley Whitfield, plus a large plot on the other side of the road. A few hundred yards on the right, further along towards Oxford, there is large abandoned sports field. The entire 880 house allocation for Biddulph would fit into these three sites. Where is the evidence that Stoke has no	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						land? There are many, brownfield sites (H&R Johnson?) in the Stoke on Trent area. Perhaps the developers do not like them, but the citizens like their green belt more. The citizens should be given priority. That is what community involvement means.	
PO163	Mr Barrington Webb				Object	Western boundary of this site is Biddulph Brook which forms the Eastern boundary of the Sewage Works. Document produced by Defra - Code of Practice on Odour Nuisance from Sewage Treatment Works recommends very careful consideration of Planning Authorities allowing development adjacent to Sewage Works page 16 of this document is particularly relevant. As this documents states – because of the potential increased nuisance calls from a new adjacent development, this could increase all Biddulph residents’ water charges in order to offset the cost of upgrading the Sewage Works. Increased complaints to Environmental Health at SMDC, this could also impact on Council tax bills. The SMDC have a duty of care to protect residents from statutory odour nuisance. The working capacity of the Sewage Works is compromised following heavy downpours causing the sewage to overflow directly into Biddulph Brook and causing very powerful unpleasant smells, as most residents living in the area are very much aware. Also noise nuisance from the pumps working at high speed to cope with the ‘flooding’. This noise level is especially disturbing during evenings and throughout the nights. Complaint made directly to United Utilities on 29th . April at 11.34am. In view of the above problem which is apparently caused by the design / construction of town sewer causing flooding in Gillow Heath and into Biddulph Brook - United Utilities say this cannot be solved without considerable funds, therefore it would sensible to maintain BD068 as a ‘cordon sanitaire’ (Buffer zone) between the sewage works and Portland Drive. Additional housing = additional problems = additional complaints to United Utilities and SMDC who have a duty of care to protect residents form odour/noise nuisance . SMDC Core Strategy SD Policy 4 states ‘ Pollution-sensitive developments should not be built next to polluting developments – page 108 refers. BD068 is also seen as a potential flood risk area from surface water according to the River Authority Map on website Environment Agency - GOV.UK . As a consequence of the building of new developments in Biddulph the issues mentioned above will increase. The current level of screening from a visual impact and noise from the sewage works can only be considered when	• See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO155 regarding site screening. • See response to PO155 regarding presence of United Utilities pipes under the site. • See response to PO155 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						the deciduous trees are in full leaf. Building requirements for United Utilities are very specific regarding building over sewers. BD068 is probably riddled with old but still in use public sewer pipes which are probably not recorded by United Utilities given the age of some of the sewage system in Biddulph, and also a culverted watercourse therefore earth moving vehicles could potentially fracture a hidden sewer pipe which would be an environmental disaster and a health risk. As Marsh Green Road is a single lane cutting with BD068 considerably higher than the road level access to the proposed development would have to be adjacent to the bridge over Biddulph Brook, therefore exiting the site turning east or west would turn into head on traffic as it is a single lane road in both directions. Also there is no footpath from Portland Drive going west. The road could not be widened to the required width of a feeder road complete with pavements to access BD068. Any development allowed on BD068 would severely impact on the Marsh Green Road/A527 junction which is already dangerously inadequate for the number of vehicles using Marsh Green Road which includes farm vehicles – tractors and trailers for example. Also Marsh Green Road is totally unsuitable for construction vehicles. The weight limit of the bridge over Biddulph Brook is unknown. Data provided by Staffordshire County Highways in October 2015 gave the following results for the A527:- Northbound direction shows that on an average day (24hrs) 7958 vehicles drive along Congleton Road. Of these 7958 vehicles the 85 th percentile speeds were 34.4mph. The peak of the volume was at 17:00 hrs with 601 vehicles travelling in this direction. Southbound direction shows that on an average day (24hrs) 7318 vehicles drive along Congleton Road. Of these 7138 vehicles the 85 th percentile speeds were 33.6 mph. The peak of the volume was at 17:00 hrs with 724 vehicles travelling in this direction. An average weekday peak hour two way traffic flow of 1325 vehicles. Obviously these figures will increase with additional development in Biddulph and there appears to be no planned road management improvements within the SMDC Local Plan.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO135	Mrs D Jacobs				Object	The area would be accessed via Marsh Green Road. This is a narrow road which current traffic negotiates with difficulty. Increased housing in this area would cause increased difficulties especially at the junction of Tunstall Rd where the recent building of housing on the former Selectus site has already caused increased congestion and at time dangerous crossing. Two way traffic needs to be maintained on this road for the large tankers accessing the water treatment works and therefore the increase in traffic would cause considerable difficulties. The road is accessed by many families walking / biking to the bridal path. The additional traffic would make it very dangerous for these people to travel to and from the beautiful passage way. An extra 70 houses would put undue pressure on local schools. Both the first and middle schools close by are oversubscribed. They have recently been impacted by the Selectus site new builds. The proposed school sites would not be within walking distance for families moving into the BD068 site, therefore extensions would be required to the existing schools. This would not be in place prior to the homes being built causing pressure on the system. The houses would be built really close to the water treatment works which would cause difficulty selling the homes due to the noise and associated ongoing activities of the plant through the day and evening. The building of homes on green belt land will further detract from people wishing to live in Biddulph. These fields form a boundary between the North of Biddulph and the Willow Heath community. Homes on this site would merge the two together, further eroding the integrity and identity of the areas.	• See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO132 regarding Education. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding and capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review.
PO976	Mr Peter Turner				Object	The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes private properties (experienced by 34, 36 and 38 Essex Drive). Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. 1. "The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, noise, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes which are deemed to	• See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO132 and United Utilities (top of this table) in response to this consultation. • See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO155 regarding highways. • Site BD068 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • No contradiction with SMDC Core Strategy Policy SS5b 'Biddulph Area Strategy'. Sites within the urban area and an extension to the urban area are included as well as extensions in the Green Belt identified as part of the Green Belt Review as stated in the policy.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						be (individually or cumulatively) environmentally unacceptable and by avoiding unacceptable amenity impacts by refusing schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments, or polluting schemes adjacent to pollution sensitive areas, in accordance with national guidance.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 2. During periods of heavy rainfall, the sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). 3. This happens on a regular basis, with the latest occurrences being in November 2015 and March 2016, when both United Utilities and the Environment Agency were forced to clear the pollution (Environment Agency staff (identified by uniforms) in Biddulph Brook witnessed by residents). 4. Residents in Gillow Heath (York Close, Essex Drive, Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, Marsh Green Road) are repeatedly contacting United Utilities & SMDC to deal with cases of noise, odour and raw sewage pollution. Houses should not be built even closer than these. It contradicts the following SMDC LDF Core Strategy statement: “The NPPF directs Councils to proactively provide needed economic development - however decisions should ensure that new development is “appropriate for its location” in pollution/contamination terms; and more generally development should contribute to securing good standards of amenity and reducing pollution.” SMDC LDF Core Strategy. Section 8.2.11 6. The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17,000 residents. The population of Biddulph as at 2011 census was 19,892 residents. An increase of 885 houses (approx. 3,000 people) will obviously require investment in this facility. This will not be facilitated by the inclusion of numerous small development sites, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to effectively utilise the CIL. 7. Email received from United Utilities by myself on 8/6/16 states, “We have held a recent discussion with officers at the local planning authority regarding the emerging development plan and specifically discussed the possibility of new housing near to the wastewater treatment works. In undertaking an assessment of which sites are most suitable, we feel that it is appropriate to highlight to local planning authorities the proximity of sites near to wastewater treatment works. We have explained that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. We have identified the need for the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them.” Therefore, the utility provider advises against releasing development land close to the water treatment works. Evidence of best practice shows waste treatment works not recommended for close boundary development. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed...”will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk...” The site is in Flood Zone 2 Development close to the waste water and sewerage treatment works will result in increased raw sewage overflow close to the nearby residences as well as polluting the watercourse, Biddulph Brook. Neither the distributor road (Marsh Green Road) nor the feeder roads (Portland Drive) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are at least two pinch points on Marsh Green Road which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Marsh Green Road is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. The feeder road is far below the minimum design standard for radii of access road bends – measuring less than 8m (Standard = 10m) The feeder road is below the minimum design standards for width - 4.9m (Standard = 5m) The distributor road (Marsh Green Road) is significantly below minimum design guidelines with a minimum measured width of 4.3m (Standard = 6.7m). Access to Portland Drive and the site off Marsh Green Road is restricted from both directions by a very tight bend and a road narrowing pinch point a maximum width of 5.4m, below the design guide standard of 6.7m. The junction of Marsh Green Road with Congleton Road is significantly below required standards for vision splay (south) due to the incline of the approach to the junction and tree line obstructions. Fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed due to narrow roads and regular on-street parking.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 “ Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development.” This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town. Improvement works to the adjoining, and only, United Utilities waste water and sewage treatment works requires massive CIL contribution, which is only possible from a large-scale development elsewhere. Improvements to feeder and distributor road accesses are not possible due to the relatively small scale nature of the development.	
PO748	Mr Paul Malkin				Object	Save Biddulphs Green Belt Firstly I would again like to comment that the Councils marketing of this consultation has been extremely poor, it has been left to residents associations and concerned residents to spread the bad news in their community. As council tax notices were sent to all residents a few weeks prior to the consultation starting then I would have expected the promotion of an important issue like this to have been included in that delivery. I feel SMDC have missed a real opportunity to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to produce a North Staffordshire plan that could deliver the required housing whilst protecting green belt and identifying brownfield sites to continue to regenerate the area. When I asked if this had been considered at the Biddulph consultation meeting the council officer advised me that this had not been considered as “nobody wants to live in Stoke”. I find this attitude from a council officer pretty appalling and if this is the attitude of the planning team then no wonder an innovative partnership approach had not been considered. Stoke have been successfully regenerating and redeveloping brownfield sites in the area for many years and I believe SMDC could learn a lot from their approach. In addition Stoke and Newcastle are where the job opportunities are being created and many residents of Staffordshire Moorlands will travel there for work and leisure and probably would want to live in these areas. The proposed sites for development are not only in green belt areas, but also along the boundaries of existing residents. The sites are going to have a detrimental impact on	• The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. • See response to PO132 regarding developing sites in Stoke instead. • See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (in particular Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph’s housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • See response to PO132 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • It is agreed that affordable housing is needed locally. Site BD068 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes so will contribute to this need. • See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						current council tax payers of the district who purchased properties at an inflated rate due to overlooking beautiful open fields. These residents are not only going to lose their beautiful views but also thousands of pounds from the value of their homes. I propose a number of sites that will have a minimal impact on the green belt and current residents. The Mills in Station Road and Walley Street are in desperate need of repair or regeneration. These could either be developed into apartments for young first time buyers or older persons or demolished and new properties built. This accommodation is far better situated close to the town centre and will keep the area more in keeping of the newer properties around them. There is also old brownfield land available either side of Congleton Road in Knypersley, the former Victoria Colliery site and the land behind Bemersley recycling centre off Childerplay Road. All of these sites have much better access to the main roads than the proposed sites that are all reliant on single track country lanes. What is required locally is housing to meet the needs of local people, there are key issues to address, young people can not get onto the housing ladder and have to resort to renting that can cost more than mortgage payments and there is an ageing population that require housing to meet their needs. What I would expect the planning department to complete before any development plans are signed off is a thorough research project to identify what is actually required locally, what is affordable to the local community and what the mix of starter homes, shared ownership and social rent homes should be. The Housing and Planning Bill has recently been passed and this includes the development of starter homes for first time buyers as part of the affordable housing requirement. These homes can be for sale up to £250,000 outside of London. Local salaries of young first time buyers would not make these affordable, SMDC must ensure that affordable homes to purchase are for sale at a price that local people can afford. The type of houses that are required should also be researched, surely the requirement is for smaller affordable homes, 1 bed apartments for singles and couples and older people to downsize to and then 2 and 3 bed homes for young families And not 4 and 5 bed homes that will generate developers a greater return and the council higher rates of council tax. I also made a freedom of information request to the district council with regard to the recent development at Uplands Mill in Biddulph asking for the breakdown of owner occupation, shared ownership and social housing and how many nominations had been made for local people to the social	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						landlord, unfortunately this has not been provided in time for me to include this within this response. The reason I made this request was to be able to identify if there was a need for social housing in Biddulph or if the housing association had to widen its search for tenants to the north west, which I believe to be the case. In addition to the above, the below comments are why I feel the proposed sites should be reconsidered. Highway - too narrow, single vehicle for most of Marsh Green Road and Well Lane. At the junction with Congleton Road the carriage way is raised in both directions making it extremely difficult to see fast moving traffic coming either way. Congleton Road to Stoke gets congested and backs up at Knypersley lights and Chell roundabout, this will get worse with other developments so residents will naturally take the lanes towards Gillow Heath and up to Mow Cop and Harrishead. These lanes are single tracks with blind bends, where the road widens in Gillow Heath parked cars make it difficult to pass and the bus currently has problems getting through. Pedestrians use this lane with no pavement going to cycle track and children going to school and numerous properties in Marsh Green Road lead directly onto road, any increased traffic will make these roads dangerous and put users of them more at risk. Construction traffic will also find these areas increasingly difficult to navigate. Environment - after heavy rainfall there is often smells from the sewerage plant and it is known to overflow into the stream. Following heavy rain Marsh Green Road is like a river for many hours with water flowing from the fields, should this water be caught in the drainage system the sewage works will be constantly overflowing. The sewerage works is already servicing more properties than it is designed to. Schools - as there are currently not enough first school places for children that live in the area, I assume the schools will be built first before any housing development. As a new first school is to be built has a review taken place to ensure that there will be places at the local middle and high schools to accommodate these additional children, or are class sizes going to increase resulting in a drop in educational standards?	
PO1108	Ann Wright				Object	What type of provisions would be provided for the stream and river management for the houses in Akesmore Lane? Also the water treatment facility as this is at capacity NOW. The proposed plots BD062 and BD068 would stop the treatment plant from being enlarged and at the moment the odours from the present plant are terrible as you walk along the track or Long Valley Road.	See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10281	Cllr Chris Wood				Object	Sites such as BD062 and BD068 are completely unacceptable because the authority has a duty of care to ensure smell from sewerage works do not cause issues for housing within the proximity of the sewerage works and the site in Biddulph does emit odour which is both distasteful and unpleasant.	See response to PO155 regarding odour from sewage works.
PO2705	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	2 sites in Biddulph are adjacent to the same watercourse. There is a floodplain extent on the western boundary but this is poorly defined at present. A level 2 assessment will be required for these.	The site boundary can be amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site.
PO4634	Mrs Wendy Boothroyd				Object	I do not think these areas are suitable for housing for the following reasons: Access Marshgreen Road is a narrow road in some places less than 10feet. With steep banks and in one part it is single track with a very sharp blind bend leading to a narrow bridge which crosses the cycle tracks. An increase in traffic would be very hazardous to people walking the tracks. Also this round is not suitable for heavy vehicles. There is no street lighting which makes it very dangerous for the children walking to school. Landscape The land between Portland Drive there is a deep gulley which was once a water course. This has been culverted but when it rains heavily it still floods. Local knowledge is that the land in this area is unstable due to shifting sand which would make it unsuitable for housing. Flood Plain The land adjacent to Biddulph Brook, and again particularly the level of the Brook rises causes flooding issues. When I moved here my insurer could not transfer my insurance because the post code flagged up as a flood risk area. Housing being built nearer the Brook could possibly find themselves un insurable as company's now ask if your 100 meters of a water course, Sewage Works The sewage works is screened by trees for part of the year, but during the Winter Months is quite visible. Housing in this area would have a clear view if the metal structure, and quite often when work is being carried out large floodlights are used. Also the noise when the pumps are going is obtrusive in Portland Drive, also the smell on occasion is very offensive so property nearer would even more inconveniences which could become an environment issue. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the following statement by letter dated 26 th May 2016: We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the waste water treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues, and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new	- See response to PO155 regarding highways. - See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. - See response to PO155 regarding site screening. - See response to PO132 and United Utilities (top of this table) in response to this consultation. - See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO132 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. - See response to PO155 regarding highways. - See response to PO132 regarding amenity issues.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						housing sites that are not close to a waste water treatment works. Green Belt The government have emphasised the importance of Green Belt in preserving communities in their areas. These sites form a natural barrier with Gillow Heath and if these sites plus others were developed semi-rural areas would be engulfed and densely populated suburb without Green spaces will be formed. Infrastructure Development on this site would fall into the catchment area for Woodhouse Middle School, and Oxhay School, both schools are always well subscribed and therefore maybe unable to cope with a large intake. Also the junction on Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road has very poor visibility and increase in traffic would make the junction more hazardous and dangerous. Amenity The properties adjacent to the Green Belt in Portland Drive are all single story dwellings, and regulations state that new development should be in keeping with these properties. If this is the case then development on this land could only consist of single storey dwelling's as loss of light and privacy would be an issue to existing properties. Additional Sites As Brownfield sites are supposed to be the preferred option, there is a large area of the properly restored former Victoria Colliery on Brown Lees Road. Also there is a large area of land east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph allocation with very little impact on existing residents with ready access to main road and bus services.	
PO4615	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	BD068 - Originally planners agreed 300ft gap to sewerage works this fills the gap. Concerns re access and proximity to sewerage works, other concerns with noise and smell not recommended for inclusion.	• See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour of water treatment works.
PO5730	Mrs Eileen Smith				Object	I object due to impact on highway infrastructure.	• See response to PO155 regarding highways.
PO7223	Mr B Roberts				Object	Northern plots – York Close, Marsh Green, Portland Drive. These developments are very close to the sewerage works. Problems remain with proximity and also capacity and space available for any possible need for expansion of the sewerage works.	• See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works.
PO7367	Mr John Hayley				Object	As a Biddulph resident I call on SMDC to remove areas BD062 & BD068 from the 2012-2031 Local Plan Preferred Option Sites. I believe that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council needs to consider the following: Areas: BD062, BD068 and BD083 1. In my view it is totally inappropriate to build new housing on	• See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO155 regarding site screening. • The land is privately owned so delivery of a community forest is

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						green fields within the Green Belt in such close proximity to Biddulph's sewage treatment plant. I would not wish future generations of my family to have to live in such housing and it is not appropriate to make town boundary changes in this vicinity. It would be impossible to produce a "wide choice of high quality homes" at this location (NPPF paragraph 50) and the type of housing that could be built here is likely to have a large negative effect on social cohesion and quality of life within the existing Gillow Heath community. This development would harm the reputation of this area of Biddulph from a housing perspective. 2. Because of its proximity to the urban environment I believe that it remains sensible for the sewage treatment plant to be heavily surrounded by trees. One suitable productive use of this land might therefore be, not to use it for housing, but to use it instead to secure reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Options might include: carbon capture, forestry and coppicing, or creation of a small Community Forest – all done in support of a low carbon future for Biddulph.	unlikely.
PO6736	Mr Michael Martin				Object	Object to BD068 - site is TOTALLY unsuitable for development.ALL of these sites are within metres of a full to capacity sewerage works already working to overcapacity. We regularly have sewage smells, the nightly warring of machinery, and when walking in the adjacent fields have seen evidence of sewage overflow. The health limitations are obvious,.The lane leading to BD087 is one cars width, no footpath,houses adjoining the lane have their own boundaries right up to the lane. Many years ago my wife and i together with numerous neighbours attended a site meeting at the actual works and were told by a United Utilities area manager that the houses in Portland Drive,York Close, and Long Valley Road should never have been built..... we register our total objections to this area.The preferred area was the old Victoria Colliery that has been totally reclaimed and is ready to use.	● See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. ● See response to PO155 regarding highways. ● See response to PO132 regarding Victoria Colliery as an alternative location for development.
PO8305	Mr A Hague				Object	Site has poor access to main road A527 Would spoil green belt which i feel would spoil nice area of Biddulph Question who would choose to live any nearer to a sewage works than the houses in Marsh Green Road and Portland Drive We can occasionally hear noise from the sewage works at night. The odour has improved since 1980s but we still get smells occasionally Preferred Sites - The Old Victoria Colliery Land off Childerplay Road Mills close to town centre. All have good access to A527 Would not spoil green belt question why spoil green belt and spoil what we have in Biddulph.	● See response to PO155 regarding highways. ● See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. ● See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. ● See response to PO132 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. ● See response to PO748 regarding use of derelict buildings in Biddulph.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9048	Mr and Mrs Siddorn		G. Willard		Object	Object to inclusion of this site. The site has significant highway, drainage, ecology, odour and other constraints which local people will require the LPA to address.	• See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • The Council has had an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken on this site in 2015. The site has been deemed to have ecological importance due to the presence of trees with bat roosting potential, potential reptile populations and good connectivity to other biodiverse habitats. The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended prior to any potential development works being carried out: ▪ A bat survey regime to ascertain whether bats roost in the tree ▪ Reptile survey ▪ Badger survey ▪ Vegetation removal at the appropriate time of year There is no evidence at present to suggest that the site cannot be developed for ecological reasons.
PO9007	Mr Denver Johnson				Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices. The infrastructure of our little end of Biddulph has always been strained by the population level, to suggest that the number of houses could be doubled is ludicrous. The main drawbacks to our location have always been increasing traffic on the A527 (it's too crowded now), flooding (gardens in the best drained locations tend to get boggy in Winter - the weather is getting wetter and some local actions like selling off the Grange and allowing the marsh drying Rhododendrons to be mass destroyed didn't help) and when the wind is in the wrong direction, the smell from the close sewage works. The placing of large developments even closer to the sewage works seems more like a criminal act than a thoughtless oversight. The Abbeystead, Lancashire waterworks disaster of May 1984 where a methane gas explosion severely wounded forty four people and killed eight outright including a mother and child should never be allowed to be forgotten. The cause of ignition has never been determined, however the good sense of at the	• See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO748 regarding property values. • See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO9048 regarding ecology. • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are "There is one Grade II* and eight Grade II Listed Buildings, and a Registered Park and Garden which is also a Conservation Area within the 400m buffer. There was no public access on to the site which is elevated above Marshgreen Road, and it is at a similar level to the adjacent residential development on Portland Drive. Development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the settings of the heritage assets as development would be seen in context of the existing housing estate. Development would not adversely affect HLC zone BBHECZ 8 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms." • The land is privately owned and no public rights of way cross the site.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						very least leaving as many fields as possible around them was once enforced by law. Private takeover of Public utilities seems to have greyed this issue. From an explosives perspective (I'm a Physical Science Graduate) placing houses closer to such an installation is akin to packing a bomb with shrapnel and strapping innocent victims to it! Won't allowing these developments be exponentially raising the risks of the site being used as a terrorist soft target? How many other locations are there Nationally like this one, with the added blast focus of the steep valley sides? New houses on the proposed sites would not just be putting lives of new residents at risk. Wildlife - Biddulph attracts some rarities like buzzards and herons, sustains a large population of wild rabbits along with frogs, toads, snakes, foxes, stoats, badgers and hedgehogs. Pheasants, crows jackdaws, jays, magpies, woodpeckers (green and spotted) along with a large variety of the smaller birds. All of these animals would be hit by the loss of the green spaces and the draining of marshland. Heritage - Biddulph originated in the lee of the old 13th century Norman fort/castle built in Bailys Wood. All of the Mediaeval village would have been centred on the brook. The road from the South along the brook would have been important, but the fair road that no longer exists, running East West through the village would probably have been more important to the community and the North road out towards Congleton may not have been there since the fort was put there to control the area boundary. Bradley Green was the name of the village now using the name Biddulph. See 1806 map: http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/maps/series?xCenter=3216685.06303&yCenter=2985192.16842&scale=633600&viewScale=181417.4208&mapLayer=nineteenth&subLayer=smith_1806&title=C.%20Smith%20New%20Map%20of%20Great%20Britain%20and%20Ireland&download=true Biddulph Castle - Biddulph Lea Forge http://www.gatehouse-gazetteer.info/English%20sites/3308.html Archaeology - ancient Biddulph is still buried below the fields (inc. BD087) between Marsh Green Road and Bailys Wood. Bakers South field (BD068), from hearsay, was called 'the old garrison' - it's sited ~1000M South West of the old Biddulph Hall and would have been a very probable place for a Parliamentarian cannon battery during the Civil war. I've found shards of what appear to be iron age or older pottery in this field close to the brook. I've got this depiction from a mix of reading and hearsay, but am currently in contact with 'The Biddulph Museum'. See: http://biddulphmuseum.com/index.html Flooding - Marsh	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Green gets it's name from a long history of flooding. The glacial alluvial valley floor is an area for subsidence even without the help of the many mines close to the area and the existence of a large underground reservoir at our end of the valley that is the reason for there being less pit shafts this end. Access - Marsh Green road is a single track, dangerous to the many pedestrians that have to cross it daily on their way to the old railway line (Biddulph Valley Way - Route 55) and cars that face meeting on the sharp blind bend next to Suttons old farm. Marsh Green Road was at it's safest when it was blocked off at the sewage works entrance to facilitate work on the bridge over the brook. BD068 - has a history of flooding. The field is boggy during the Winter and Spring with signs of subsidence. The field seems to have had several old mill ponds fed by the brook, they will have powered small grinding mills during the eighteenth Century. The middle field and field closest to Marsh Green Road seem to have a man-made escarpment between them, most probably the remains of a seventeenth Century gun emplacement/ cannon battery from the English Civil War. I have found pottery fragments on the surface of this field that appear to be ancient: fourth Century or older maybe. Biddulph brook regularly gets charged with raw sewage, it gets much of it's volume by taking the constant discharge from processed sewage: it is categorically 'unfit for human consumption'. During the Summer the field is home to local cattle, it regularly hosts wild life. The field provides a pleasant buffer zone between the houses on Portland Drive and the houses to the rear. In the cold months it makes an excellent dog walking space used by many local people.	
PO9036	The Hart Family		Rob Duncan		Object	Whilst this site is acknowledged to have a limited impact on the Green Belt owing to it being effectively enclosed by existing development, the narrow and convoluted nature of Marsh Green Lane means that enhancements to the local highway network are likely to be necessary. By comparison, my client's site benefits from two existing vehicular access points onto parts of the highway network that are suitable for additional traffic, and which will enable vehicles to pass safely.	See response to PO155 regarding highways.
PO9225	Mr Peter Wilshaw				Object	(Summary) The development of future Housing and any future Solar Farm installation would squeeze the natural life from the valley. It would deplete the Green Belt and detrimentally and dramatically alter the landscape and negatively affect the wellbeing of the people of Biddulph and in particular Gillow Heath. I hope that planners will reconsider the preferred option taking into account the following; Unsuitable road network . These proposed housing sites are situated along the gateways	- See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. - If the site is taken forward in the Local Plan, exceptional circumstances which justify its release from the Green Belt would have to be demonstrated. - See response to PO132 regarding landscape impact. - See response to PO155 regarding highways. - See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						to our countryside and walking tracks e.g. Akesmore Lane, Holy Lane, Mow Lane and Marshgreen Road. These narrow roads already carry an unacceptable level of traffic which when combined with a heavy footfall of walkers with children and animals presents a real danger. This danger is also manifested in the fact that they all lead to crossroads on the A527 at Marshgreen and Smithy Lane which are difficult places to emerge from. If these lanes require widening or other safety upgrade it highly likely the ancient hedgerows will be destroyed and therefore the characteristics of that landscape lost for ever. Situating parking places at various spots on the west side of the valley at medium to high elevation would enable access to many walking tracks and elevate the mix of cars and people on the narrow lanes. Diminishing of the Green Belt in the short and long term. The release of Green Belt land, according to the NPPF, should only take place in “exceptional circumstances”. There is not statement to say what those circumstances are and why land can be released in Biddulph and other places but, not in Leek? Biddulph valley is also a gateway to the moorlands and The Peak District National Park. It was granted the title of “The Garden Town of Staffordshire” and over twenty years of volunteer effort to showcase the town, Biddulph in Bloom Charity has won many RHS Heart of England in Bloom awards and in 2015 came second in the National Large Town category. I feel that the location and magnitude of these developments will adversely affect the confidence, so hard fought for, in the effort to improve our town and increase tourism. Sites BD062, BD068 and BD087 are unsuitable areas to build houses being adjacent to a water treatment plant and the Biddulph Brook. In many respects this plan does not meet the Core Strategy of SMDC and SCC in meeting their own obligations stated in the Historical Environment Assessment Report which is to protect and retain the character of the landscape and follow and develop many of the recommendation therein. There is a finite limit to the availability of land on which to build houses and the limit to where the wellbeing and recreation of the population is detrimentally affected. The County’s Historic Environment Assessment demonstrates that this area has historic value in terms of heritage and historic landscape character.	• See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO9007 regarding heritage impact.
PO9687	Mrs P Hancock				Object	Access (Mow Lane) is too narrow.	• See response to PO155 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10223	Mr Graeme Court				Object	(Summary) Strongly object to the allocation of this site due to the following reasons: 1) It would prioritise building in the floodplain. The land acts as a natural soakaway for rainwater. (Photos attached). 2) site is next to the Water Treatment Works where there are issues of odour and noise. (Email from United Utilities attached). 3) during periods of heavy rain, the sewers cannot cope and raw sewage is admitted to drains in Marsh Green Road finding its way into Biddulph Brook. Development would exacerbate this and would be contrary to adopted Core Strategy SD4. 4) The land is currently used for grazing 5) it would damage the amenity value of this part of Biddulph 6) the site is in the Green Belt and there are other sites available for development. 7) site is a conduit for diverse wildlife. The Phase 1 survey stated that other surveys needed to be carried out. 8) March Green Road is a very dangerous road. Further development would exacerbate problems here. This would be contrary to Core Strategy T1. 9) BD068 is too far from the town centre. 10) The capacity of the water treatments works is insufficient. More recently Biddulph NT gardens have agreed that their waste can now go via the works which will make things worse.	• See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO9048 regarding ecology. • See response to PO155 regarding highways.
PO10091 PO10130	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding Mrs Anne Young				Object	(Summary) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Proximity of the sewage works which is already overloaded; Flooding of raw sewage; Flooding of brook (see picture attached); Amenity issues associated with sewage works e.g. noise; Local road network could not cope with further development; Emergency access; Impact on ecology; Impact on infrastructure - e.g. doctors surgeries are full; Impact on Middle Schools and High School which would not be able to cope; Lack of demand for new housing - Uplands Mill units have not all sold; Loss of Green Belt; and Not the best use of CIL. I think that this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	• See response to PO155 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO155 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO132 regarding amenity issues. • See response to PO155 regarding highways. • See response to PO9048 regarding ecology. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See response to PO132 regarding Education. • The new Local Plan will cover a period to 2031 so lack of demand (perceived or actual) at one point in time is not a valid reason for not meeting the area's objectively assessed housing needs (as required by Government policy). • See response to PO132 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response PO9225 to regarding exceptional circumstances for loss

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							of GB. • See response to PO976 regarding community benefit • The land is privately owned so cannot be designated as Public Open Space. The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016). Local Green Space supersedes the Visual Open Space designation (which is an old designation not supported by Government policy in the NPPF).
PO4570	Mrs L Jones				Object	Also sewage works at full capacity and proposed overlooked. Plots BD062 & BD068 would appear to prevent enlargement of the existing treatment works, also more Dr's places needed can't cope with what we have got.	• See response to PO155 regarding capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO10091 regarding infrastructure.
PO4671	Mr Arthur Potts				Object	Objections to developing site BD068 for housing and changing it to omit this site from its protection. I am now in possession of a copy of Town Councillors Court letter to you dated 09.26.2016 regarding proposed housing sites BD068, BD062 and BD067. I fully support and endorse the statements and arguments put forward by Councillor Court. However, I am extremely concerned regarding the entirety of these 'Planning Proposals' which appear to be superficial overview to increase the population of the town of Biddulph without any considerations of the town itself. The existing car parking provision is currently hardly adequate at busy times to relate to the functions of the town itself. To include major residential developments this will generate considerable additional car ownership will have a most adverse effect on the town centre itself due to the physical inability to provide essential additional car parking provision. If these housing proposals as tabled at the moment are carried forward Biddulph will become purely a dormitory town centre servicing the North Staffs/South Cheshire. The High Street of Biddulph is currently fighting to survive. These housing proposals will accelerate the demise. Councillor Court in his communication details brown field site closely situated within the town centre itself and if these sites are actively pursued as a priority surely people will be able to walk into the town itself, for shopping/clinical and other pursuits. Surely Chartered Town & Country Planners should consider these housing proposals in conjunction with the impact of the functions of the town itself to achieve a well-	• See response to PO10091 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO748 regarding use of derelict buildings in Biddulph.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						balanced and vibrant town for the community. I trust the above comments will be considered in a serious manner as the present governments financial programmes are destroying the social fabric of our community.	
PO10192	Rev Lindsay Clowes				Object	I object.	Comment noted.
PO10019	Mrs C Cliffe						
PO9995	Mr D Cliffe						
PO10126	Mr R Meadowcroft						
PO10088	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft						
PO8886	Mr M Clews						
PO8110	Mr A Forrester						
PO7752	Mr R Bradbury						
PO8401	Mr G Price						
PO8441	Mr A Gresham						
PO7949	Mr A Lehepoo						
PO8955	Mr C Goodwin						
PO8866	Mrs J.A. Bennett						
PO8812	Mr and Mrs F T Rowley						
PO8624	Mrs M Booth						
PO8326	Mrs S Bennett						
PO8552	Mr R Scales						
PO8572	Mrs J Sailes						
PO8946	R Hutton						
PO8908	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO8922	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8820	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO8947	Mrs E. Smart						
PO7832	Miss L Siddorn						
PO7147	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7439	Mr K Flannagan						
PO7416	Mr J Banister						
PO7409	Mrs J Banister						
PO8489	Miss L Delves						
PO8377	Mr John James						
PO8508	Mrs Gillian Flannagan						
PO8126	Ms Barbara						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8422	Griffiths						
PO8258	R Hutton						
PO8362	Mr C Kirkham						
PO8470	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO8449	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO6704	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO6239	Mrs D Cook						
PO6392	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO6313	Mr B Wilson						
PO6217	Mr A Gresham						
PO6321	Mrs P Newton						
PO6520	Ms S Wilson						
PO6944	Mr S Wilshaw						
PO6506	Mr and Mrs C.B. Dodds						
PO6282	Mr K Wilshaw						
PO6486	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO6360	Mr Gilbert Bradley						
PO6302	Mr V A Bainbridge						
PO6620	Mr J Robertson						
PO6584	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO6562	Mrs Beverley Holding						
PO6542	Mr Jeffrey Leese						
PO6671	Mrs Ann James						
PO6426	Mrs J M Slater						
PO7021	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO7001	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO6891	Mr R Lawton						
PO6871	Mr G Mason						
PO6406	Mr A Copeland						
PO5960	Mr P Squires						
PO5456	Mr M Clews						
PO5834	Ms Diane Copeland						
PO5938	Mr Carl Mason						
	Mrs Kathleen Boulton						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD068 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5855 PO5812 PO5997 PO5018 PO7084 PO5366 PO5950 PO5927 PO5894 PO8839	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr Christopher Slater Mrs L Price Mr R Milner Mr C Kisicki Mr S Leese Mr H Ebdon Mrs J Smith Mrs B Bainbridge Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO4880 PO5835 PO5939 PO5856 PO5736 PO5893 PO8924 PO9665 PO9870	Mr Allan Knapper Mr Carl Mason Mrs Kathleen Boulton Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mrs Eileen Smith Mrs B Bainbridge Mr and Mrs G Bowyer Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mr Gayle				Support	I support.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1317	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary - full version attached) With regards to site references ADD04, BD069 and BD117, these sites appear likely to discharge to that area served by Severn Trent for the provision of wastewater services. It would be useful to confirm with the respective landowners the likely point of discharge to the wastewater network from these sites so that we can confirm the receiving wastewater infrastructure and therefore better understand the impact.	Points of discharge to the wastewater network are a detail which can be confirmed at a later stage in the process once the sites have been allocated in the Local Plan and detailed development schemes become available at the planning application stage.
PO2594	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO4616	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	BD069 - This site was originally the Hall Kitchen garden. There are moves that this site should be restored as a Heritage Kitchen Garden. Until these possibilities have been investigated this site should be withdrawn, not recommended for inclusion.	The Council's Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) assesses this site in terms of heritage and landscape impact. The results for heritage are: "There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a walled garden to the hall, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts." This study forms part of a wider evidence base to support the Local Plan. Therefore, the conclusions within this report will be weighed against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of a site for development.
PO5042 PO6224 PO8314 PO8827 PO10004 PO10097 PO10188	Mr G Boulton Mrs P Newton Mr A Hague Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch Mr Ray Lloyd Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding Rev Lindsay				Object	I object to this site	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8073 PO8620	Clowes Mrs V Jackson Mrs M Booth						
PO7315	Mr Mohammed Yasin				Object	As the owner of Knypersley Hall (Star Listed Building) I am totally against the development of 30 houses at BD069 and 150 houses on site ADD04. I bought the Hall in 2006 in a very poor state of repair. The department of Conservation insisted that all repairs must be done to restore the Hall to its original state. Part of the Hall had 6 apartments this was changed to 2 dwellings in the interest of less traffic on site and protection of the environment. I was assured by the conservation department that no further development would take place around Knypersley Hall. By allowing this development you are actually surrounding the Knypersley Hall with new housing. This will totally destroy the character and the look of the Hall. Site BD069 is the garden that used to belong to Knypersley Hall and still is physically next to the Hall. How can such development get the blessing of the Department of Conservation. Please reconsider the impact of putting such a large burden on the existing infrastructure and the residents of Knypersley.	See response to PO4616 regarding heritage impact.
PO9049	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				Object	(Agent - G. Willard) Object to inclusion of this site.	Comment noted.
PO10274	Mrs C Williams				Object	Former Knypersley Garden Centre off Orme Road This area was the kitchen garden for Knypersley Hall Grade 11 listed, as would have been within the original curtilage of the hall, the walls and structures within this area should also come under the listing. As this has a significant historical interest, I have concerns that this will be destroyed if land is used for residential developments.	See response to PO4616 regarding heritage impact.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9018 PO9020 PO9019 PO9021	Mr C Lunt Mr Alan Worthington Mr N Lunt Mrs Josie Worthington				Object	Listed building / conservation area and Landscape In 2010 the council commissioned a Historic Sites Assessment report which identified this site as part of a historic park and garden in the Historic Landscape Character assessment conducted by Staffordshire County Council, that report recommended that development in this area is not appropriate. The assessment marked every indicator (evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal) value of this site as high, I think it was the only area within the report that achieved such a high score. The reasons for this score are varied but one of the main drivers is the fact that James Bateman grew up at Knypersley Hall and this particular area is where he executed his first landscape designs and where the Victorian walled garden is located. Parts of that walled garden have been knocked down by the site owners however the Historic Sites Assessment determined that there is good potential for restoring and/or conserving the heritage assets which contribute to the zones historic character, the walled garden and other structures within BD069 would be an ideal place to begin that restoration. The BBC commissioned a television programme in August 2015, experts on the programme stated that Biddulph Grange was the most important Victorian garden in the country (and therefore the world), what value does that place on the location where the designer of that garden executed his first landscape designs? The HEA stated that the links with Biddulph Grange and with James Bateman, the creator of some of the gardens at both sites, is of particular importance and recommended the site be adopted into the Green Infrastructure Plan. I agree with some other comments posted on the public consultation website that the BD069 area has become derelict but I don't agree that the only way to add value back to the site is to build houses on it. I also think we should question why the site has become derelict. It is our understanding that basic planning permission was granted for the building that was erected on this site at the same time that one wall of the historic walled garden was knocked down, however the council aren't certain that the conditions set out in that permission were adhered to. In 2007 the council seems to have realised the mistake that previous members had made by refusing a request by the owners for a certificate of lawfulness for existing use of a garden centre. Two of the reasons for that refusal were due to the area being in green belt (it's now classified as historic parks and gardens) and because the site is classified as a special landscape area. A member of the local historical society (J N Sherratt) has written a statement claiming that English Heritage visited the site after the garden centre was opened and remarked that the knocked down wall of the Victorian walled garden had to be rebuilt, the fountain should be reinstated, the rock features and pulpit (from where it is understood James Bateman gave orders to his gardeners) should be tidied up, trees had to be replanted for those that had been felled, all paths had to be made good, greenhouses had to be repaired, a new hot house needed to be built and new natural fencing should be erected. Mr Sherratt	Comments noted. - See response to PO4616 regarding heritage impact. Regarding flooding, no concerns about development of this site have been raised by the Environment Agency nor the Lead Local Flood Officer to date. The Council's ecological evidence consists of a Phase I ecological survey undertaken in 2014. This recommends that: - A bat survey regime is recommended to ascertain whether bats roost in the trees - Reptile survey - Great crested newt survey of nearby pond - Vegetation removal at the appropriate time of year In addition, a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' (ie.SBI) designation for all preferred option sites. The results were: "The broadleaf woodland may be of ecological value and may allow for the site to gain SBI/BAS status once the vegetation has been fully recorded. Furthermore, the site offers potential to support bats, reptiles and amphibians, The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended in order to establish SBI/ BAS status: - An extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, as the assessment could not be fully completed due to issues with access. - The tree which has the potential to support roosting bats needs to be further assessed. - Reptile survey required. - Newt survey required on the pond (pond 4 in ADD04)". The above survey work would need to be undertaken before any development could take place on the site as clearly it would inform a site layout. The Council must consider all the evidence and reach a decision as to whether to continue to promote the site for redevelopment.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						claims none of this was done and claims that English Heritage didn't follow it up because one of the officials passed away. To back this up, Mr Sherratt is planning on contacting Derek Wheelhouse, the local historian who was the driving force behind the reopening of Biddulph Grange and is still active there today. Attached is a picture that provides an understanding of what part of this site was like prior to being destructed by the owners, it shows the 3rd wall that was demolished but unfortunately doesn't encompass the historic springs, greenhouses, fountain, rock or pulpit. If the council did decide to allow the building on this site they would be rewarding the owners for knocking down historical features and then letting a site of historical importance rot away so that it becomes derelict. The decision by the council in 2007 to refuse the application for a certificate of lawfulness for existing use suggests the council understand the importance of this site, they now need to follow the recommendations of their own historical environment assessment and enforce the recommendations of English Heritage so that the site is brought back to its original state and conserved for future generations. This site should have been added to the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Heritage Register a long time ago to prevent it getting into its current state of disrepair. The council has stated in its Local Heritage Register Supplementary Planning Document that for inclusion a site needs to meet the criteria below. Sites which are representative examples of a style or layout, or a type of site, or the work of an important designer. Sites associated with locally significant persons or historical events. Sites which are of intrinsic interest and contribute to the character of the area. This site meets all the above requirements and it's difficult to understand why or how the site has been overlooked. Had it been added, the document states that ' Owners are encouraged to carry out regular maintenance in order to safeguard the historic fabric and avoid the need for more costly repairs in the future. Continued inclusion on the Local Heritage Register may help in maintaining the value of the property '. Unfortunately, not being on the register means this encouragement doesn't appear to have happened. Fortunately though, the HEA recognise the site can still be renovated and brought back to its original state. The HEA assessment that was conducted utilised the guidance provided by English Heritage in their document 'Conservation principles: policies and guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment'. At the point the HEA was conducted the council should have applied for this site to be added to the Heritage at Risk Register held by Historic England, this may have brought the site to the attention of Historic England again and the preservation and renovation may have already begun. The council says it needs to build 1100 houses in Biddulph, some bold decisions need to be made, houses will have to be built in greenbelt areas. 30 houses in this area would admittedly make a tiny dent in the housing requirement however ignoring the recommendations of the HEA and losing the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						opportunities to restore this site to its former glory and reestablish its connections with Biddulph Grange for future generations would be a decision that could never be reversed. This isn't one of the bold decisions the council will need to make, it's an obvious one. Taking all the above evidence into consideration, most of which was available to the council via their own Historical Site Assessment I was surprised that the council summarized that evidence on the site assessment form with the line 'capacity may be constrained due to presence of historic features'. That is quite an understatement. The council's own evidence has recommended that development in this area is not appropriate and the council should show they have the courage to support the convictions of their findings. Flood risk The site assessment form says a flood risk assessment is needed but SCC has no specific concerns. I've questioned the council on this and they pointed me at the 'evidence base' section of their website, so I looked at the 'Strategic flood risk assessment' but noticed that this site wasn't covered in that document. I then emailed the council and asked 'where is the flood document that led the council to have no specific concerns? I'm asking as the site is next to a lake so just trying to understand how you determine that there are no specific concerns.' The council have responded as follows 'This information was obtained from consultation with the Lead Local Flood Officer at Staffordshire County Council'. I'm not certain how well the Lead Local Flood Officer knows the site but he can't be aware that the site is next to a lake, has an abundance of wells, naturally occurring springs and a very high water table or I would have expected the officer to have had some very specific concerns particularly around the effects of sinking further foundations into land of this nature and the proximity of the lake. Nature conservation I asked the council 'Am I correct in thinking the ecological studies evidence base didn't look at this site or the lake next to it? If so - what determines where ecological studies are performed?' The response was 'Nature conservation entails the conservation of wild plants and animals and natural and seminatural habitats. The purpose of a Phase 1 Habitat Study is to provide a knowledge of the nature of these habitats and of their location, extent and distribution. Phase 1 survey information is collected by inspection of each habitat unit in the field by a trained surveyor. Once the findings are known it can be determined whether a more detailed 'Phase 2' Study is required or not. The Council has had a Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken this year on a large number of sites to ensure that its ecology information is as up to date as possible. The survey includes BD069. The survey is currently being finalised and is expected to be published by the end of October 2015.' This means that although the council are using conservation to assess whether or not a site is suitable, at the point of completing the site assessment forms that habitat survey had not been undertaken. This site is next to a lake, I would have expected the ecological studies evidence to have included this site prior to the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						assessment being drawn up as I'm confident that would also recommend against development. Since then the survey has been undertaken however, the officer performing the survey did not enter the site as the gates were locked. Additional comments in relation to SHLAA record - should point out that the land is in a greenbelt area that has been classified as historic parks and gardens in the HEA and HLC. > Strengths / opportunities - should say that this is one option for tidying up a derelict site but that all other options should be explored rather than lose a piece of local history that is of national importance due to its close links to the Grange and one of few surviving Victorian walled gardens in the country. > Weaknesses / Constraints - should say that the council commissioned Historic Sites Assessment report recommended that development in this area is not appropriate. > As the site is next to a lake, has an abundance of wells, naturally occurring springs and a very high water table I think the SCC should have some specific concerns re: flooding. > Suitability – This section should point out all the above comments as each one provides insight into the unsuitability of this site.	
PO7583	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements.	Comments noted.
PO4679 PO4678 PO4577	Mr and Mrs J.C. Longmore Mr Robert Longmore Mrs P Barry				Support	We wish to support the site options for the site of site ref: BD069 We are residents in Biddulph and have known the site for 30 years. It was formally a garden centre which closed 2003 and since become derelict and neglected, we support the use of this land for housing for the following reasons: It is brown field site contiguous with the neighbouring residential area. It will contribute Biddulph acknowledged housing shortage. It is neglected and has been a target of vandalism and arson. The security fencing gives it an industrial appearance. Development would give an improved appearance for the neighbouring homes. It is sustainable and close to schools and neighbourhood and town centre services. It can be very easily linked to the existing road networks. It is immediately available. It is flat and no evident building constraint. It can be linked to mains services and there is no flood risk or polluted grounds. Please allocate this site.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9022	Mr & Mrs Weaver				Support	We write in support of the proposed allocation of the above brownfield, former garden centre site for residential development, inclusion within the town boundary for Biddulph and removal from the Green Belt. We write as owners of the site since 2003. The site has been in our family since 1940s when our family moved to Biddulph. In writing this letter we have taken advice from town planning consultants and have reviewed the consultation documents available on the Council's website. The following sections of this letter establish our reasons for supporting the proposed allocation of this site for residential development, including within the town boundary and its removal from the green belt. Please take this letter as a formal response to the Site Allocations Preferred Options consultation in respect of the site and Question 15, 17 and 19 in particular. The Site and Surroundings The site extends to approximately 1.02 hectares (2.5 acres). The land is shown on the plan attached at Appendix 1 (Ref. SF498873). The site is approximately one kilometre to the southwest of Biddulph town centre, which contains a variety of shops and facilities including a library and leisure centre. The land is bounded, to the north, by Orme Road, beyond which is Biddulph High School. To the south of the site is the Mill Hayes Playing Fields. To the east and west of the site are primarily residential areas. To the south west of the site is a Knypersley Hall which is a Grade II* listed building. The site is a brownfield site which comprises of a former garden centre which was in operation from the late 1960s to 2003. The site is partly covered by greenhouses, other garden centre buildings (as shown on the enclosed photograph) and extensive areas of hard standing. The buildings on site have become dilapidated and have fallen into a state of disrepair following the closure of the Garden Centre in 2003. There are also a number of trees located along the site boundaries. The Principle of Development The Council's adopted Core Strategy (March 2014) identifies a need for 6,000 dwellings in the District between 2006 and 2026. The Core Strategy commits to undertaking an early review to cover the period 2016 – 2031 to ensure that future provision will continue to meet objectively assessed needs. It also states that the Council will seek to enhance the role of Biddulph as a significant service centre and improve the local housing market by increasing the range of houses and allocating deliverable housing sites within the urban area and, on land adjacent to the urban area. Policy SS5B of the Core Strategy states that sites identified adjacent to the urban area of Biddulph shall be in locations which relate well to the urban area, can be assimilated into the landscape and would help secure infrastructure improvements. The supporting text to Policy SS5B states that due to the extent of green belt around the town, opportunities for peripheral expansion are limited. Therefore, it establishes that in order to meet the longer-term needs of the town, some development will be required in the green belt. It states that up to 2026 there will be a need for a minimum of 813 dwellings in Biddulph, of which land for around 200	Comments noted. See response to PO4616 regarding heritage impact. The Council must consider all the evidence and reach a decision as to whether to continue to promote the site for redevelopment.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						dwellings would need to be identified in the green belt. Policy SS5B, therefore, states that the allocation of small urban extension sites will require a comprehensive review of the green belt boundary around Biddulph to accommodate the new dwellings through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and an early review of the Core Strategy. We understand that the Council has recently reviewed the position in relation to local housing need accounting for the latest Government household projections, new population and employment data. The Council's updated Housing Need report, from January 2016, concludes that the housing need for the District is between 250 to 440 homes per year between 2012 and 2031. Therefore the Council's Preferred Options document proposes an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year up to 2031. In relation to Biddulph it identifies a requirement for 1196 new dwellings (855 net) during the plan period to 2031. Therefore, we support the general growth strategy for the District and the focus on the delivery of the majority of housing and employment in the main towns, including Biddulph. We also support the proposed allocation of the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site, within the town boundary, for residential development to help contribute towards meeting the housing needs for Biddulph, for the following reasons. We understand that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that the fundamental objective of Green Belt policy, as established in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is to prevent urban sprawl. Paragraph 79 establishes that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their "openness" and "permanence". However, by virtue of the site's former use as a Garden Centre and the built structures on the site, including various garden centre buildings and green houses, it is considered that the brownfield site does not effectively serve or perform the five purposes or functions of the Green Belt established in paragraph 80 of the NPPF: " to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. " Moreover, the edge of the site is well defined and visually contained by the existing trees and soft landscaping which are located along its boundaries. The trees and change in levels at the site boundary sever the site from the green belt to the south, in physical and visual terms. This results in the site becoming a pocket of brownfield land that is visually isolated from the main area of green belt to the south. Therefore, development of the garden centre site would result in no visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield land, such as the garden centre site, which would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it would not be	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. By virtue of the visual containment of the site it is considered that the redevelopment of this brownfield site for housing would not have any greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or its function and would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The land to the south of the site is not in agricultural use and is the Mill Hayes Playing Fields, which are used by Biddulph High School. It is considered that the northern boundary of the playing fields would provide a more appropriate, clear, defensible boundary for the green belt along a physical feature or use which is readily recognisable and likely to remain permanent in line with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Moreover, we note that the Council's Green Belt Assessment, undertaken by Amec Foster Wheeler, in November 2015, confirms that the Knypersley Hall Garden Centre site makes a 'limited' contribution to the purposes and function of the green belt, is "potentially suitable" for removal from the green belt and comprises: "Previously developed land with reasonably strong outer boundaries and which would create a logical extension to the current settlement envelope." We also note that the Council recognises, in their Options Site Assessment document (which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document), that in order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need to be adjusted as there are insufficient sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate Biddulph's housing requirement to 2031. In proposing the site as a preferred option for removal from the Green Belt and residential development the Council clearly considers that the site is in a sustainable location that is contiguous with the neighbouring residential area that surrounds the site to the north, east and west. The Council clearly agrees with our view that the site is in an accessible location with good levels of accessibility to range of facilities on foot and by public transport. This is confirmed by the Council's site assessment which states that the site is well related to the residential area and is close to Biddulph High School and other facilities. Moreover, there are several bus stops in close proximity to the site. These are located on Park Lane and Mayfields Road (less than 300 metres walking distance from the site). The bus stops are served by a number of bus routes which provide access to the various shops, facilities and employment in Biddulph Town Centre and further afield to areas including Congleton, Newcastle and Hanley. As stated previously, the site is brownfield land and contains various garden centre buildings and greenhouses. Unfortunately, since the closure of the garden centre in 2003, these buildings have fallen into disrepair. The site has also been the target of both vandalism and arson. Therefore, it considered that the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for residential development would enable a viable use for the site and provide the opportunity for the existing dilapidated structures on the site to be replaced by a viable, secure and	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						efficient use of the land for residential development, which would contribute towards meeting the identified housing needs for Biddulph. Given the sustainable location of the site and its accessibility to services and facilities in the town centre it is also anticipated that the site could make an appropriate contribution to meeting affordable housing needs in the district. The site is currently contained by security fencing due to the issues surrounding vandalism and arson. This gives the site an industrial appearance to dwellings surrounding the site. It is considered that the development of the site would also, therefore, provide the opportunity to improve the appearance and security of the site for residents living nearby. Technical Constraints It is understood that a suitable access to the site could be provided from Orme Road. Moreover, the development of the site would offer the potential opportunity for associated improvements to the 'un-adopted' Orme Road by a potential developer. Given the former use of the site as a garden centre it is not anticipated that there would be any issue or constraints to development in terms of ground conditions or contamination on the site. It is also understood that, given the former use of the site, and its location contiguous with the settlement boundary and nearby residential development, the site could be easily linked to mains services. The site is also fairly flat and there are no evident building constraints. According to the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. at low risk of flooding with less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding). According to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) residential development is a "more vulnerable" use to flooding. The NPPG confirms that residential development would be considered an appropriate use in Flood Zone 1. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015) also confirms that the site is in Flood Zone 1 at low risk of flooding. However, we note that there appears to be a minor error in the Options Site Assessment document, which accompanies the Preferred Options Site Allocations document, which suggests that the site is located within a flood zone. There are number of trees located within the site. However, the majority are located towards the site boundaries. Therefore, it is considered that the majority of the quality existing trees on the site could be effectively incorporated in to the design and layout of the site at a later stage. Moreover, the site is not subject to any designations relating to the conservation of ecology or biodiversity. Although the site is located adjacent to Knypersley Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building, as stated in the Council's Site Assessment, the site is secluded and separated from Knypersley Hall by the adjacent lake and a significant number of trees and landscaping and falls outside the curtilage of the Listed Building. Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site for approximately 30 dwellings would not result in any significant impact on the designated heritage asset or its setting, subject to appropriate design. We understand that the Council is currently	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						commissioning a heritage impact assessment, in conjunction with Heritage England, for all the sites selected as Preferred Options allocations and we look forward to reviewing the outcome of this in assessment in due course. We are not aware of any technical constraints that would prevent development of the site for housing. However, should the Council require any further technical information to consider or support the suitability of the site for residential redevelopment and removal from the Green Belt we would be willing to investigate this further and provide any information where possible. Capacity and Deliverability The site is approximately 1 hectare in area. It is assumed that it could be developed at a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare, given its rural location. Therefore, giving an indicative site capacity of 30 dwellings. This is reflected in the Preferred Options document which indicates that the Council agrees that the site is capable of delivering circa. 30 dwellings. The site is immediately available for residential development. Therefore, assuming that development of the site could commence within two years of the allocation of the site (in the Council's Site Allocations Document which is expected to be formally adopted in 2017), following the grant of planning permission, we anticipate that the total number of dwellings would be constructed and delivered within a further year. Conclusions We trust that our responses above provide sufficient confirmation of our support for the allocation of the site in the Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), its deliverability and its possible contribution to the Council's housing delivery in the short-term, given the identified shortage of housing in the District.	
PO8690 PO7738 PO7698 PO7764 PO9660 PO9684 PO10135 PO10174 PO10083 PO10064 PO10163	Mrs Joan Draisey Mrs E Griffiths Mr J Shelly Mr R Bradbury Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs P Hancock Mrs Anne Young Mr Robert Chambers Mrs Claire Meadowcroft G B Ford Mr N Clowes				Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD069 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10014 PO9992 PO10199 PO10121 PO10109 PO10040 PO10030 PO10151 PO9867 PO7124 PO7359 PO7143 PO7451 PO4875 PO5453 PO6179 PO6016 PO5014 PO5029 PO4906 PO5089 PO6379 PO6997 PO6328 PO6523 PO8368	Mrs C Cliffe Mr D Cliffe Mrs I Tranter Mr R Meadowcroft Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt Mrs B Rowland Mr Gayle Mrs A Cunliffe Mr E Hilditch Mr A Atkinson Mr K Flannagan Mr Allan Knapper Ms Diane Copeland Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr P Price Mr R Milner Mr F Moorhouse Mr B Barcoft Mrs L Neate Mrs K Chaddock Mr R Lawton Ms S Wilson Mr S Wilshaw Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO23	Mr Robert Moseley				General comment	This area seems to be the best of all the bad solutions to the supposed housing problem in Biddulph, building up to the the old railway line would give some expansion within the current boundaries.	Comments noted.
PO471	Mrs Jean Wrench				General comment	A balanced approach is required.	Comment noted.
PO1058	Mr Nicholas Tavernor				General comment	I do not agree that Biddulph needs this number of new houses and think they should be developed at the minimum rate so there is not an abundance of unsold property that will reduce house prices and negatively impact on residents. The proposed housing allocations need to be developed in line with the development study findings, which suggested there would be a reduction in numbers of families and young people and an increase in numbers of elderly, no point in building houses for people who are leaving.	- The proportion of 20% of the District's housing development taking place in Biddulph has been through extensive consultation and public examination as it is taken from the Council's Core Strategy which was adopted in March 2014. - The Local Plan is planning for the period up to 2031 so will allocate a number of sites in Biddulph in order to meet the need. These will not all be built at exactly the same time, they will come forward as the market demands. - Property values are not considered material in planning law. - The Local Plan will reflect the evidence gathered about the housing market. The key document is the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
PO2588	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO2887	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	These sites are adjacent to, or overlap with a Biodiversity Alert Site. Design and layout should avoid impacts in this site, enhance it where possible, and maintain linear habitat connectivity.	Comments noted. This will be reflected in the site policy and the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.
PO5138	Mr Gary Harding				General comment	Biddulph bypass benefits Biddulph building on the west side.	Comment noted.
PO5145	Ms Karen Harding				General comment	If Biddulph needs to be developed it should be from the town centre out to the west. The bypass would also serve this area well.	Comment noted.
PO5149	Ms Melissa Harding				General comment	Building on the west side of Biddulph would start to give Biddulph a more even balance in terms of development. The site of the new primary school would be in walking distance from a lot of this new development.	Comment noted.
PO5182	Mr J. Denton				General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO4871	Mr Allan Knapper				General comment	i support all the 7 sites.	Comment noted.
PO5118	L C Millington				General comment	Apart from the areas north and south (which I have no comment on) I think it right to allocate housing to BD055, 63a. 108, 106, 156, 16, 71, 71a, 76, 76a, and ADD003. The housing will be close to the town centre – more likely that people will use it. The visual impact looking from Biddulph Moor is hard to visualise, but it will be less than an expansion of Thames Drive estate will be from Mow Cop.	Comments noted.
PO5123	Ms Lynne Evans				General comment	Plan to balance out the already developed north east Biddulph sites. The old railway track has many more access routes that lend themselves to making developments here far easier, this area would avoid the problems experienced around the new uplands mill developments, with its squeezed together look and unattractive outcome.	Comment noted.
PO5128	Ms Lynne Evans				General comment	The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comment noted.
PO5112	Mr Cottrell				General comment	All the proposed houses where the residents work they would have to commute to find work the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road site would have been closer to the areas of employment e.g. Chatterley Whitfield site.	Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt. Sites BD071, BD071a, BD106 and BD156 are not in the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO5080	Mr J Neate				General comment	As stated above the level of homes in Biddulph area is at a saturated level. Moving west makes much more sense.	Comment noted.
PO5163	Mr N McQuade				General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comment noted.
PO5190	Mrs A Denton				General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comment noted.
PO239	Mr Robert Stockley				Object	I have already stated that the erosion of the Green Belt is of major concern, and would be the beginning of the end of our beautiful Biddulph Valley. I suggest that the Victoria Colliery Site, and Childerplay Road sites are the preferred options, which would develop sites, which are ready and open for development with easy safe access to all concerned.	See response to PO5112 regarding use of Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road for housing.
PO441	Mrs Janice Deane				Object	All areas. There is no access to any of the sites described without increased pollution and log jams of traffic trying to get out of the town for work. There's no work here.	- County Council Highways have said that development here is acceptable in principle subject to access design and Transport Assessment. - Employment sites are proposed at BD117 (opposite Victoria Business Park) and BD076a (north of BD071).

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1335	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Other sites which have potentially high ecology value are: BD 071 and 071a covered by FID 17 - regional ecological value. These should be assessed against the Staffordshire LWS criteria. There are also a number of species-rich hedgerows identified by the surveys.	The conclusions from the Ecus LWS survey are that the broadleaf woodland may be of ecological value and may allow for the site to gain SBI/BAS status once the vegetation has been fully recorded. Furthermore, the site offers potential to support bats, reptiles and amphibians. The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended prior to any development taking place in order to establish SBI/ BAS status: • Hedgerow survey following the HEGS methodology. • Detailed vegetation survey to determine the status of the habitat mosaic. • The buildings and trees which have the potential to support roosting bats needs to be further assessed. • Reptile survey required.
PO1360	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			Object	Map 4.5 Biddulph - BD055; BD106; BD108; and, BD156 - preferred housing allocations - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocations on the Grade II listed buildings (former Parsonage, school and the Church) and their setting, individually and cumulatively, has been considered. Further information on this is required.	Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: <u>BD071/BD071a</u> There are seven Grade II Listed Buildings within the 400m buffer. Due to topography and surrounding vegetation, development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the settings of the assets. Mitigation may include screening in the south-eastern part of the site. Development in the site would change a large element of the HLC zone BBHECZ 3 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). However, with sensitive design, this could be mitigated. Site suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning. <u>BD055</u> There are seven Grade II Listed Buildings within the 400m buffer. Development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the settings of the assets, however, mitigation should include screening along the southern edge of the site to reduce effects. Development would not adversely affect the HLC zone BBHECZ 3 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning. <u>BD106/BD156</u> There are seven Grade II Listed Buildings within the 400m buffer. Development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							settings of the assets. To reduce effects, mitigation should include setting development back from the assets by keeping development to the west and north of the site as well as employing screening along the eastern edges of the site. Development would not adversely affect the HLC zone BBHECZ 3 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning.
PO857	Mrs Andrea Millington				Object	Previous studies and documents by SMDC have identified that Cheadle has the highest capacity for growth, the least greenbelt impact and could facilitate a higher degree of development with less risk and yet they have been allocated the same nominal figure of 20 percent of the overall allocation as has Biddulph. At the recent consultation in Biddulph the chief of planning agreed that the previous local plan had over estimated demand for housing in Biddulph which had resulted in planning permission for nearly 200 houses and as the realisation of lack of demand hit the developers they had to readjust their building plan and revert to social housing styles and attempt to attract people from cities such as Liverpool and Manchester despite the planners at the time of the planning process recommending only 20 percent social housing on the development all of which would be to accommodate those in the Staffordshire Moorlands that required affordable of social housing. This clear lack of judgement could be at play again when expecting Biddulph to build 1,100 homes in 15 years possible resulting in a population growth of 5,000, a boom of which has never happened in the towns history. As the governments main and seemingly only stipulation is pro growth if there is to be such a growth of the town then the vision for Biddulph must include developing the Town Centre which a more balanced geographic development supports. The by-pass greatly benefits developing on the West side, and looks like it was planned to support the expected housing allocations for Biddulph.	See response to PO1058 regarding housing numbers for Biddulph.
PO5158	Mrs C. Nicholls				Object	I don't agree that Biddulph needs to have the number of properties allocated and I understand that the neighbourhood plan designate the land for the governments directorate. I agree that the sites designated off the by-pass will balance the town out better, (i.e.: BD055/BD108/BD106/Bd071 and BD071a).	See response to PO1058 regarding housing numbers for Biddulph.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5262 PO5263	Mr P Rushton Mrs S Rushton				Object	Please forgive my way of communicating on the issues but I feel that the following experiences of living directly by the Uplands Mill site all the time the building work has taken place for ages, it has been a nightmare for my wife. The constant noise of the vehicles moving round the site, the smell the dust, all houses all of the day, increase In footfall, litter, foul sewages and the changes to the planning of the site, councillors with vested interest' this site and possibly more? I feel that I have no trust in whatever the process. I therefore do not support any further building in the Biddulph area. Pennine Way at times resembles the A road and not just the main estate road it should be, my quality of life has certainly diminished where the because of the Uplands Mill Sites.	Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations.
PO6012 PO5999 PO5663 PO5538 PO5449 PO6027 PO6896 PO6876 PO6856 PO6134 PO5752 PO5714 PO7184 PO8450 PO8378 PO8051 PO8012 PO8029 PO7986 PO7165 PO8534 PO7867 PO7753 PO8402 PO7951 PO6954 PO6543 PO5435	Mr P Price Mrs L Price Mr K Davies Mrs M Moffatt Ms Diane Copeland Mr T Barker Mr M Mason Mr G Mason Mrs I Latta Mrs J Collier Mr J Hammond Mrs D Whalley Mr A Nixon Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr John James Mr B Hyde Mr N Goode Mr K Parry Mrs A Brown Mrs G Hall Mr D Neal Mrs J Banister Mr R Bradbury Mr G Price Mr A Lehepoo Mr K Allen Mrs Ann James Mrs K Hallam				Object	i object	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5495 PO5478 PO7286 PO6800 PO7834 PO7890 PO7910 PO7418 PO8634 PO8612 PO8783 PO7778 PO8967 PO8347 PO141	Mr M Cook Mrs L Cook Mrs C Dale Mr M Owen Miss L Siddorn Mrs S Sharrock Mr J Swindell Mr J Banister Mr R Booth Mrs M Booth Mr S Holdcroft Mr R Hindmarsh Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr N Mosson Mr Carl Webb						
PO4912	Mr B Barcoft				Object	BD071 and BD071a - i object	Comment noted.
PO6990 PO6152 PO6785 PO6487 PO7532 PO6922 PO8146 PO7971 PO7350 PO8911 PO8867 PO8683 PO7710 PO8327 PO8070 PO8663	Mr R Lawton Mr K Collier Mrs A Jones Mr Gilbert Bradley Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs Mrs J Brennan Ms Janet Lawton Mrs C Hensor Mr E Hilditch Mr and Mrs I Condliffe Mrs J.A. Bennett Mrs Joan Draisey Mr D Bradbury Mrs S Bennett Mrs V Jackson Mr A Malbon				Object	I object to 2 of the above sites	Comment noted.
PO6861 PO8092	Mr A Copeland Mr K Davies				Object	I object to 3 of the above sites	Comment noted.
PO8554 PO6361	Mr R Scales Mr V A				Object	I object to 1 off the above sites	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
	Bainbridge						
PO10093	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding				Object	Object to BD106 and BD156 only.	Comment noted.
PO9789	Mr M Barlow				Object	Please do not spoil the entrance to Biddulph bypass area by removing trees and bushes. They will hide any houses built there.	Site screening will be required as part of any new development. This can also help to act as a noise barrier.
PO304 PO538	Mr Russell Picken Mrs C Picken				Support	Site BD116 and the area of site BD140, adjacent to sites BD071 and BD071a should be included for the following reasons: This development would start to rebalance Biddulph in the right direction, i.e. it would start to move the town centre back towards the centre of the town. A proper, suitably sized road system / infrastructure for the new housing estate could be built, capable of accepting future extension of the site. It should be built with direct access to the bypass. There is already an access road into site BD140, which passes the boundary of BD116 at its north-west corner. It originally formed part of Wharf Road, but was bisected by the construction of the bypass. Although currently in poor condition, it could be upgraded and has the benefit of already having access across the BVW, in the same manner as that found in Marsh Green Road. New properties in this area would be much closer to the town centre. This could encourage people to walk, particularly for limited shopping. This then has the advantages of being more environmentally friendly and also reducing the traffic in the town and parking requirements. New housing developments in this would have much less of a visual impact on the area and would not constitute 'urban creep'. A strip of visual open space could be included between the development and the BVW. This would make the new housing development more appealing visually, both from within the development itself and when viewed from the BVW. This could also act as a wildlife corridor. These sites are well placed to take advantage of some of the new services and facilities, i.e. the new Primary Health Care Centre, which is within easy walking distance, from these sites, for most people. These areas could be developed without dominating the outlook from existing properties. Also they would not overlook the said existing properties. The development of these sites would not add to existing property flooding issues. The BVW would provide a relative safe and easy access to the playing fields at Gillow Heath, either by walking, or by cycling. These sites could comply with items 1, 2 and 4 of the 'T1 – Development and Sustainable Transport' section of the 'Preferred Transport Policies' from the 'Core Strategy Draft Preferred Options' document, as shown in Appendix A.	Comments noted. This area is being investigated by the Council.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO325	Mr Frank Cottrell				Support	Of the 850 proposed new build houses the working residents of these properties would have to commute due to lack of employment in the Biddulph area. To develop the Victoria Road and Childerplay Road sites would be closer to the proposed Chatterley Whitfield employment site.	- See response to PO441 regarding lack of employment. - See response to PO239 regarding use of Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road for housing.
PO290	Mr David Spruce				Support	Developing here is close to the town centre and bypass. Good access and easy to reach town centre without transport.	Comments noted.
PO722	Mr Philip Beech				Support	I wholly support the utilisation of this broad area. The use of this area can be seen to be positive for the town centre, as it is close to the main arterial road and town centre amenities. Development of this area will have minimal negative impact on the residents adjacent due to the natural terrain. Access is easy, directly from or near to the bypass, which is not the case on some of the now constrained sites.	Comments noted.
PO779	Mrs Jayne Beech				Support	The use of this area is a sensible one due to the close proximity to the town centre. A minimum amount of negative impact will occur if this area is developed as it is overlooked by few houses. If the area isn't developed it may well become an overgrown blot on the landscape, which is far less appealing than a sympathetic high quality development. I support the use of this area for development.	Comments noted.
PO456	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				Support	I think the Councils need to build more attractive and spaced out homes to help them raise more council tax as central funds dry up, and the proposed areas may benefit the town.	Comments noted.
PO10289	Mrs Julia Hackney				Support	Green Belt amendments for Biddulph: while i don't agree that Biddulph needs this number of new properties i understand that unless we take control through the Neighbourhood Plan we risk developments running wild. The bypass was built to accommodate [housing, industry] buildings. Green Belt sites highlighted on the west of the bypass was set aside for building projects when the bypass was built. Doing this centralises town and local amenities. Housing allocations in Biddulph: the bypass greatly benefits developing on the west side and looks like it was planned to support the expected housing allocation. New proposal is agreeable if they increase the amenities to the town centre, ie doctors, car parks etc.	Comments noted.
PO654 PO661	Mrs Siobhan Perry Mr Andrew Perry				Support	Building here balances out the town and give easy access for residents to the bypass and the town centre.	Comments noted.
PO760	Mr Paul Malkin				Support	It makes sense to use this land for development if extra homes are required, with easy access to the A527 and the town centre and will also not negatively impact current residents.	Comments noted.
PO1059	Mr John Hayley				Support	In principle (and subject to more detailed planning) I support the potential use of these sites for future housing.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5248	Kyoko Boll				Support	I propose ADD003, ADD004, BD069 and BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156, BD055 and BD063a as the plan of housing development in Biddulph. These sites are able to get to road access directly a can be reduced existence of the traffic who people who have to travel to the town centre and main roads. Specially, ADD004 as a plan to build a new school. I also prefer to extend to the west areas such as Akesmore Lane, Brown Lees and alongside old railway track which gives the opportunity to build housing developments.	Comments noted.
PO5179	Mr J. Denton				Support	We support development to the west of the Biddulph Town.	Comments noted.
PO5232	Mrs I E Sefton				Support	The development of areas to the west should swallow units of growth while protecting open spaces. They will enable residents to have easiest access to all the amenities.	Comments noted.
PO4603	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Support	BD055 – already approved, recommended for inclusion.	Comments noted.
PO4608	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Support	BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 - Meets all criteria, provided that the water course and a decent wildlife corridor is kept as a stream and not diverted / culverted. This could be enhanced to form a nice town river walk linking the developments along this side of the bypass, recommended for inclusion.	Comments noted. The details of the scheme will be determined at the planning application stage and these will be open to public comment.
PO5338	Mr D Heath				Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options give the opportunity to achieve a better balance of the town.	Comments noted.
PO5341	Mr D Heath				Support	The west side of the bypass lends to the better development to support the town.	Comments noted.
PO5860 PO5026	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan Mr F Moorhouse				Support	i support BD055	Comments noted. This site now has a planning consent for extra care housing.
PO5261	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				Support	Thank you for listening to the residents and taking the off Thames Drive and Pennine Way (Most encouraging). ? Congleton Road from Mow Cop and looking across the Valley it seems vital to retain that green	Comments noted.
PO4916	Mr B Barcoft				Support	I agree with BD106 and BD156	Comments noted.
PO5090	Mr J Neate				Support	Development the Biddulph Town Centre will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5222	Mr I Seabridge				Support	Essential to maintain character of the area with a definitive open area space – ‘land boundary’ Existing road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate additional demand. Highways linkages and access road/egress poor. Any junction improvement at the Biddulph Road/Woodhouse Road priority junction will have an unfavourable impact on the character of the area.	Comments noted.
PO5237	Mrs P G Webb				Support	Many on the Uplands Mill development have not been sold.	Comments noted.
PO6375 PO6898 PO6877 PO7779 PO7868	Mrs K Chaddock Mr M Mason Mr G Mason Mr R Hindmarsh Mrs J Banister				Support	i support 1 of these sites	Comments noted.
PO6153 PO6080 PO6117 PO6133 PO6991 PO6000 PO6633 PO6921 PO6488 PO6507 PO8868 PO8684 PO8533 PO7950 PO8077 PO7970 PO6521	Mr K Collier Mr I Frisby Mrs J Frisby Mrs J Collier Mr R Lawton Mrs L Price Mr Ronald Bailey Mrs J Brennan Mr Gilbert Bradley Mr K Wilshaw Mrs J.A. Bennett Mrs Joan Draisey Mr D Neal Mr A Lehepoo Mrs V Jackson Mrs C Hensor Mr S Wilshaw				Support	i support 3 of the above sites	Comments noted.
PO5311	Mr A Picken				Support	This development would help to re balance the town in the right direction. IE: back towards the centre of the town. New properties would be closer to the town centre which would mean that there would be less traffic and reduced parking requirements. This would be environmentally friendly. These sites are well placed to take advantage of the services for example the schools, health centre. It wouldn't be seen as a urban creep. There would be a less visual impact.	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5266	Mrs A Bridgette				Support	The bypass offers better development sites: It was designed that way. There would be better balances to the town. It is better to develop the town centre, making it more balanced Building here to the west is closer to the proposed site Chatterley Whitfield, gives the opportunity to the health centre and the town amenities.	Comments noted.
PO7578	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities away from the water treatment works and meeting highway requirements.	Comments noted.
PO8163	Mrs Angela Turner				Support	Support. However there is ecological interest in this area. Sites BD071 and BD071a have high amounts of species poor grassland and the biodiverse habitat is on a small area of the site mostly connected to the stream and hedgerows. This small but important part of the site should be kept as a wildlife corridor running along this side of the bypass - it should be classed as Visual Open Space.	See response to PO1335 regarding ecological value of site.
PO9040	Gallagher Developments Ltd	Gallagher Developments Limited	Mark Rose	Define	Support	I write on behalf of my client Gallagher Developments Ltd with regard to the Local Plan Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation. Following the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2014 and the identification at that time for a prompt review to roll the plan forward to 2031, my client welcomes the progression of the Local Plan, and specifically this Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation to consider how the identified development needs for the District in that period will be met. The Core Strategy provides an entirely appropriate basis for considering the most appropriate development strategy to meeting future needs, and my clients welcome the continued focus on the Market Towns in the District as the most sustainable locations for future growth. Indeed, you will be aware that they control a significant interest in “Core Strategy Broad Area 4” and welcome the proposed allocation of this land for development in principle. In light of that Gallagher Estates support the allocation of Core Strategy Broad Area 4 for development. The site is not located in the Green Belt and clearly represents a sustainable development opportunity that is well related to the existing urban form of Biddulph and its town centre. It is deliverable in that it has been demonstrated to be suitable, available and achievable, and the site’s merits were reflected in the positive comments received from the Site Options Consultation in 2015 (e.g. support from the Highways Authority). Whilst some representors did highlight some environmental sensitivities (e.g. ecology and landscape) it is apparent that there are no over riding or particular constraints to development. However, these issues can be effectively addressed through an iterative masterplanning exercise that takes into account the detailed technical and environmental assessments that will be required to support a planning application, as well as best urban and landscape design practice. The clear intent	Comments noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						would be to establish an appropriate form and character of development that would realise a high quality housing development which responds to the site's features and setting, reflects the local character, and is well integrated into its surroundings. Indeed, whilst Table 4.6 in the consultation paper refers to the delivery of 335 dwellings on the site, there is a clear need to optimise its residential capacity to ensure that the identified development needs for the town and the District are met. That will also be a critical consideration in the masterplanning process, and may require some flexibility and prioritisation in the design of an appropriate development scheme for the site (e.g. in relation to the extent and location of the public open spaces and the employment /mixed-use allocations).	
PO8328 PO8111 PO8091	Mrs S Bennett Mr A Forrester Mr K Davies				Support	i support 2 of the above sites	Comments noted.
PO9258	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	Support the proposed allocation of land at and adjoining Jacksons Nurseries - Preferred Housing Allocation reference BD108 - along with the adjoining site references BD106, BD156 and BD055, for housing development.	Comments noted.
PO10049	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	Support development here, it would balance out the town and access from these sites is easily achievable. They are within walking distance of the town centre.	Comments noted.
PO9829	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				Support	By developing this area the town would be better used and regeneration would be encouraged.	Comments noted.
PO9793	Mr Eric Biddle				Support	At present, Biddulph is not a balanced town. To put this right, areas to the west and south must be developed. Residents living within walking distance of the shops are more likely to use them. Residents are likely to work in the Potteries and if they live in this location it would save them from having to travel through the town centre to get to work.	Comments noted.
PO5579 PO5558 PO4886 PO6979 PO7011 PO6846 PO5479 PO5465 PO6062	Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw Mrs J Goodwin Mrs M Elmhurst Mrs D Stuttard Mrs I Latta Mrs L Cook Mrs J Moxon Mr R Blood				Support	Support	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6097	Mr D Cantrill						
PO5330	Mrs R Bellwood						
PO6284	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe						
PO5326	Mrs T. Cooper						
PO4870	Mr Allan Knapper						
PO5367	Mr S Leese						
PO5928	Mrs J Smith						
PO5294	Mr S Findlow						
PO6407	Mr P Squires						
PO5334	Mr G Morris						
PO5317	Mr D Lovatt						
PO5510	Mrs C Drew						
PO5523	Mr N Moxon						
PO5496	Mr M Cook						
PO5242	Mrs P G Webb						
PO5187	Mrs A Denton						
PO7041	Mr and Mrs B Carter						
PO6427	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO6821	Mr D Wickstead						
PO5388	Mrs S Harper						
PO5403	Mr G Harper						
PO5613	Mr A Barbeard						
PO7063	Mr C Kisicki						
PO6586	Mrs Beverley Holding						
PO6448	Mr Norman Smith						
PO6563	Mr Jeffrey Leese						
PO6672	Mrs J M Slater						
PO5170	Mr S Sneyd						
PO5214	Mrs L McQuade						
PO5205	Miss F McQuade						
PO5662	Mr K Davies						
PO5007	Mr R Milner						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5038	Mr G Boulton						
PO5773	Mr E Pearl						
PO5691	Mr Jason Eardley						
PO6192	Mrs Alison Wickstead						
PO6173	Mr and Mrs D Barclay						
PO5793	Mr Stephen Clowes						
PO5276	mr carl webb						
PO5279	Mrs S Purcell						
PO5450	Ms Diane Copeland						
PO5595	Mr Lewis Williams						
PO5304	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson						
PO5836	Mr Carl Mason						
PO5737	Mrs Eileen Smith						
PO5814	Mr Christopher Slater						
PO6047	Mr Reg Grimwood						
PO5063	Ms Philippa Swindells						
PO6466	Mr K Rowland						
PO268	Mr Christopher Hall						
PO7385	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7329	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO7226	Mrs L Goodwin						
PO6694	Mrs D Cook						
PO6240	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO6393	Mr B Wilson						
PO6218	Mrs P Newton						
PO6322	Ms S Wilson						
PO8662	Mr A Malbon						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8553	Mr R Scales						
PO8956	Mr C Goodwin						
PO9862	Mr Gayle						
PO10060	G B Ford						
PO10182	Rev Lindsay Clowes						
PO10157	Mr N Clowes						
PO10008	Mrs C Cliffe						
PO9983	Mr D Cliffe						
PO10196	Mrs I Tranter						
PO10117	Mr R Meadowcroft						
PO10105	Mrs V Whiston						
PO10036	Mr D Platt						
PO10026	Mrs E Platt						
PO10143	Mrs B Rowland						
PO10132	mrs ANNE YOUNG						
PO10222	Mr Stuart Nicholls						
PO9989	Mr Ray Lloyd						
PO10168	Mr Robert Chambers						
PO10079	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft						
PO10092	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding						
PO10076	Ms Heather Mason						
PO9678	Mrs P Hancock						
PO9653	Mr + Mrs A D Lawton						
PO8080	Mrs V Jackson						
PO8573	Mrs J Sailes						
PO8887	Mr M Clews						
PO8287	Mr R Cook						
PO8348	Mr N Mosson						
PO7692	Mr J Shelley						
PO7731	Mrs E Griffiths						
PO7711	Mr D Bradbury						
PO8235	Mr P Kelly						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8769	Mr J Whitehurst						
PO8704	Mr R Willlott						
PO8592	Mrs R Knapper						
PO8930	Mr + Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8840	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO8821	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO8748	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8728	Mr Stephen Willott						
PO7558	Mrs G Weston						
PO7136	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7441	Mr K Flannagan						
PO7419	Mr J Banister						
PO8221	Mrs P Kelly						
PO7118	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7349	Mr E Hilditch						
PO7100	Miss E Booth						
PO7108	Mr S Booth						
PO7495	Mrs L Carter						
PO7252	Mr A Weston						
PO7835	Miss L Siddorn						
PO7855	Mr H Whalley						
PO7911	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO8202	Mr D Smith						
PO8363	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO8471	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO8451	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO8490	Miss L Delves						
PO8147	Ms Janet Lawton						
PO8182	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst						
PO8307	Mr A Hague						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD156 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8268	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8509	Mrs Gillian Flannagan						
PO8127	Ms Barbara Griffiths						
PO8423	R Hutton						
PO7933	Mr C Kirkham						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO1313	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	(Summary) We wish to emphasise the need to carefully consider the allocation of new housing sites in close proximity to our wastewater treatment works. In this regard we note that our wastewater treatment works (WwTW) in your local authority include: Biddulph WwTW; Biddulph Park WwTW; and Flash WwTW. We wish to highlight that a wastewater treatment works can result in emissions which include odour and noise. Therefore if you are considering any sites for new allocations, especially housing allocations, near to a wastewater treatment works, you should carefully consider the sites with your Environmental Health colleagues. This is important when comparing sites close to treatment works with potential alternative sites that may be available to you for allocation. This reflects our earlier correspondence to you. The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet housing needs, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites, which are sensitive receptors, that are not close to a wastewater treatment works. We note this point is particularly relevant to your assessment of sites considered for allocation in Biddulph as part of the current Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation. In particular, site references BDO68, BDO62 and BDO87, which are sited in close proximity to Biddulph Wastewater Treatment Works. Notwithstanding this preference, if it is still intended to progress with the allocation of sites near to a wastewater treatment works for housing following discussions with your Environmental Health colleagues, we strongly recommend that your decision should be informed by: 1. an odour impact assessment; and 2. a noise assessment. If after having undertaken these assessments you still allocate land near to the wastewater treatment works for housing, we recommend that there should be detailed associated policy which identifies the need for mitigating measures including any that may be identified as a result of the assessments. We recommend that: 3. careful masterplanning is always prudent in order to mitigate the risk of odour and noise nuisance. For example, any on-site open space should be located so as to act as a buffer between the treatment works and any newly introduced housing. In addition the houses could be orientated so to most appropriately manage the impact of noise; and 4. appropriate soft landscaping is included to strengthen the buffer between the treatment works and the proposed new development.	Comments noted. Noise and odour reports have been received from the developer very recently. The noise report concludes that the site is not affected and no specific noise mitigation measures will be necessary. The odour report concludes that odour impacts at the site would not be significant and that they should not be a constraint to development. Both reports will be supplied to Environmental Health section for comments. It is now up to the Council to balance the planning issues in determining whether to select this site for development in the Local Plan. Detailed associated policy for the site will be included in the Local Plan if it is selected and it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning of the site will be required including appropriate screening /buffering.” Similarly, the recommendations given by United Utilities will be incorporated into policy should the site be taken forward.
PO2912	James Chadwick	Staffords hire County Council			General comment	With regards Site BD087 as stated in previous responses there is still no obvious access to this site. We will need to see this before we can provide a comprehensive response.	The landowner has corresponded directly with the County Highways Officer for the Staffordshire Moorlands and provided evidence that the principle of providing an access from the opposite side of Biddulph Brook using a newly constructed bridge would be acceptable to the highway officer.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO131	Mr Dave Boothroyd				Object	Comments: - Settlement area: -BD068 I do not believe that this is a suitable, or even possible area for housing development for the following reasons. 1: - Access. The area can only be reached by access along Marsh Green Road, which is very narrow, less than ten feet (3 metres) in width, with high banks on either side including protected mature trees. There are no footpaths on either side and for a large part, there is no street lighting. To the east of the site, travelling towards Gillow Heath, there is a narrow, very sharp, blind bend, followed by a narrow bridge crossing the cycle way. To the west a narrow bridge crosses the stream. Heavy vehicles could not use this road at all, and increased traffic would be very hazardous. Foot traffic, for children walking to school on Woodhouse Lane, for example, would be risking life or serious injury, especially during the dark winter months. 3: - Flood Plain issues. There are powerful counter-indications against building on flood plains, highlighted by the major floods in parts of the country in recent years. The area is immediately adjacent to Biddulph Stream. When my wife and I moved to this area, our existing insurer declined our application because our postcode was flagged as an area at risk from flooding. Indeed, there have been floods on both Mow Lane and Congleton Road in the last twelve months. Every house insurer now asks prospective customers if they reside within 100 metres of a watercourse. Any owner or tenant of a house built on this area will have to answer "Yes" to that question. Any developer needs to face the same scrutiny by the Environment Agency with respect to building on the flood plain. 4: - The Sewage Works. Adjacent to this area is the United Utilities' water treatment works. This would cause serious issues for any development on this area. The issues come under several headings. a. Visual aspects. A screen of trees hides the major part of the works from Portland Drive and Long Valley Road, in the summer at least. This is not the case in winter. Houses built on this area would have a clear and highly intrusive view of a huge steel structure of pipes, valves and pumps. Frequently vital work is carried out on this structure late into the night, using powerful floodlights. (Photographic evidence is available) b. Noise. Tanker lorries are used to remove waste materials from the works. On many occasions, installed heavy machinery (probably pumping equipment) is run late at night. Based on sound meter readings taken from Portland Drive, approximately 200 metres away, the noise level on a quiet night with the no machinery running was 46dB. On a different evening when the machinery was running the reading was 65dB. At 100 metres the sound pressure level, using the inverse square law, would be four times louder, that is 12dB more thus 77dB. At 50 metres the noise level would be 89dB, a further 12dB greater. Sustained noise levels of 90dB are a health hazard. As a reference the noise level in my very	• The Highway Authority considers that this development is acceptable subject to detailed design issues. The landowner considers that the issue of access to the site can be resolved and discussions with the highway authority have been held (see above). • Landscape Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "Site comprises land to rear of linear development on the A527, to the north of the settlement. The site slopes down from this linear development towards Biddulph Brook (located to the west of the site), and is visible from the opposite side of the valley. However, development within the site would be partially screened by trees along Biddulph Brook and would be viewed against the context of the existing development. In addition the site does not extend beyond the existing settlement edge formed by development on Beaumont Close. Site is of low landscape sensitivity." • The site boundary has been amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site. A planning application would still be needed before this (or any other) site could be developed and the Environment Agency is a statutory consultee. • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • Noise and odour assessments have been undertaken on behalf of the landowner which demonstrate that the site could be developed without significant adverse impact on future residents. • Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. • In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD087 for release from the Green Belt. • Education - The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. The County has determined that additional school provision would be required to support housing growth at the Primary phase of education. At this early stage in the site selection process there are a number of options for delivering school capacity dependant on the sites selected to take forward.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						well insulated house, in conditions of silence, was measured as 20dB, which is the accepted level for "peace and quiet" in a house. 89dB in their gardens would be a statutory noise nuisance and would not be acceptable to residents of houses built on this area. c. Smell. The sedimentation tanks are all enclosed now, mostly because of serious complaints from residents of surrounding roads in the past. However, this has not completely solved the problem of the emission of foul smells. They do occur in Marsh Green, Portland Drive, Congleton Road, Mow Lane and Halls Road quite often (Three times so far this year- most recently on Friday 6th May 2016) It would be a serious concern to anyone purchasing a house built only twenty metres away from the works, and could be a serious health hazard, from flies etc. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the following statement in a letter dated 26th May 2016:- "We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the wastewater treatment works with their Environmental Health colleagues and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works." 5: - The Green Belt, and infill between settlement areas. As recently as this month, senior government figures have emphasised the importance of the green belt in preserving communities in their areas. The original intention of "green belt" was to separate and delineate areas that have traditionally been separate. This area alone represents a clear, agricultural break between the former separate villages of Biddulph and Gillow Heath. If areas BD087, BD068, BD062, BD004, BD138a and b, BD064, and DB83 were all to be developed, a pair of semi-rural communities would be engulfed and lumped together in a densely populated suburb without green spaces. The green belt would be utterly destroyed in complete negation of both past and previous government policy. Is this what is meant by "infill"? I believe that "infill" is something to be avoided, according to the guidelines. 6: - Infrastructure. Any development on this site would fall into the present catchment areas of Ox Hey first school, Woodhouse Middle School and Biddulph High School. Each of these is operating currently at full capacity. None of the above schools have much opportunity for expansion. Prospective developers should be clear that they will need to provide the local authorities, or other providers with sufficient funds to create new schools, on new sites, within the next fifteen years, if proposed development targets are reached. Once again, taking all of the above proposed sites together, the resulting additional traffic using either the Marsh Green Road/ Congleton Road	• Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations. • Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD087. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. • The land to the north of Woodhouse Lane (west of the school) is not considered suitable for development, mainly due to the heritage impact on the nearby registered park and garden. It is also within the Green Belt. • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke on Trent City Council has its own development needs to meet.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						or the Hall's Road/Mow Lane/Congleton Road/ Smithy Lane Junction, neither of which is well served by visibility would be an extra level of hazard to junctions which are already dangerous. 7: - Amenity. Development on this site will result in a great loss of amenity for residents of Portland Drive. People who bought their houses based on the assurance that the adjacent green space was green belt land forever, will be justified in firstly, opposing its inclusion in "sites suitable for development", and, should the development ever go ahead, in seeking redress for loss of amenity. Additional Site Options: - The map of proposed sites for Biddulph shows peripheral sites around most of the current boundary, with one exception. That is land to the north of Woodhouse Lane, west of the grounds of the school, and stretching from Woodhouse Lane to the boundary of Biddulph Grange and the Country Park. There is already development on this road, and the access would be from a relatively wide road. It is a large area with few houses that would be affected by the development. Based on a comparison of the area with the Uplands development, there would be room for up to 300 houses, allowing the Marsh Green and Gillow Heath developments to be removed. It is clear that there is a large area of properly restored, former mine working land on the site of the former Victoria Colliery to the south of Brown Lees Road, and a very large area of land on the east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph Allocation with very little impact on existing residents and ready access to the main road. The preamble to the document states that some authorities have been able to agree with adjacent areas that part of their housing allocation be transferred from one to the other. It goes on to say that both Cheshire East and Stoke on Trent have no surplus land that could be considered for use by Biddulph. This is completely counter to the glaring evidence that can be gathered from a drive of no more than a mile from the southern boundary of Biddulph. There are many hectares of land lying idle and crying out for redevelopment at Chatterley Whitfield, plus a large plot on the other side of the road. A few hundred yards on the right, further along towards Oxford, there is large abandoned sports field. The entire 880 house allocation for Biddulph would fit into these three sites. Where is the evidence that Stoke has no land? There are many, brownfield sites (H&R Johnson?) in the Stoke on Trent area. Perhaps the developers do not like them, but the citizens like their green belt more. The citizens should be given priority. That is what community involvement means.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO496	Mr Denver Johnson				Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices. The infrastructure of our little end of Biddulph has always been strained by the population level, to suggest that the number of houses could be doubled is ludicrous. The main drawbacks to our location have always been increasing traffic on the A527 (it's too crowded now), flooding (gardens in the best drained locations tend to get boggy in Winter - the weather is getting wetter and some local actions like selling off the Grange and allowing the marsh drying Rhododendrons to be mass destroyed didn't help) and when the wind is in the wrong direction, the smell from the close sewage works. The placing of large developments even closer to the sewage works seems more like a criminal act than a thoughtless oversight. The Abbeystead, Lancashire waterworks disaster of May 1984 where a methane gas explosion severely wounded forty four people and killed eight outright including a mother and child should never be allowed to be forgotten. The cause of ignition has never been determined, however the good sense of at the very least leaving as many fields as possible around them was once enforced by law. Private takeover of Public utilities seems to have greyed this issue. From an explosives perspective (I'm a Physical Science Graduate) placing houses closer to such an installation is akin to packing a bomb with shrapnel and strapping innocent victims to it! Won't allowing these developments be exponentially raising the risks of the site being used as a terrorist soft target? How many other locations are there Nationally like this one, with the added blast focus of the steep valley sides? New houses on the proposed sites would not just be putting lives of new residents at risk. Wildlife - Biddulph attracts some rarities like buzzards and herons, sustains a large population of wild rabbits along with frogs, toads, snakes, foxes, stoats, badgers and hedgehogs. Pheasants, crows jackdaws, jays, magpies, woodpeckers (green and spotted) along with a large variety of the smaller birds. All of these animals would be hit by the loss of the green spaces and the draining of marshland. Heritage - Biddulph originated in the lee of the old 13th century Norman fort/castle built in Bailys Wood. All of the Mediaeval village would have been centred on the brook. The road from the	• See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO131 regarding highways. • See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • The Council's Phase 1 Habitat Study (2015) concludes that "The site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of the species poor grassland area, and has been given ecological importance in terms of loss within the wider countryside due to the potential presence of reptile populations. The following surveys/ actions are therefore recommended prior to any potential development works being carried out: - Reptile survey - Vegetation removal at the appropriate time of year" • Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are "There are three Grade II* and 21 Grade II Listed Buildings, one Scheduled Monument, and a Registered Park and Garden which is also a Conservation Area within the 400m buffer. The site is located behind existing housing. The tower of the Grade II* listed church was visible from the site but it is considered that the development would be highly unlikely to adversely affect the setting of the asset. Due to the intervening buildings and vegetation, development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the understanding of the Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area. The site is within the HLC zone BBHECZ 17 and the HEA states that designated heritage assets would require consideration (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site suitable for development in heritage terms."

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						South along the brook would have been important, but the fair road that no longer exists, running East West through the village would probably have been more important to the community and the North road out towards Congleton may not have been there since the fort was put there to control the area boundary. Bradley Green was the name of the village now using the name Biddulph. See 1806 map: http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/maps/series?xCenter=3216685.06303&yCenter=2985192.16842&scale=633600&viewScale=181417.4208&mapLayer=nineteenth&subLayer=smith_1806&title=C.%20Smith%20New%20Map%20of%20Great%20Britain%20and%20Ireland&download=true Biddulph Castle - Biddulph Lea Forge http://www.gatehouse-gazetteer.info/English%20sites/3308.html Archaeology - ancient Biddulph is still buried below the fields (inc. BD087) between Marsh Green Road and Bailys Wood. Bakers South field (BD068), from hearsay, was called 'the old garrison' - it's sited ~1000M South West of the old Biddulph Hall and would have been a very probable place for a Parliamentary cannon battery during the Civil war. I've found shards of what appear to be iron age or older pottery in this field close to the brook. I've got this depiction from a mix of reading and hearsay, but am currently in contact with 'The Biddulph Museum'. See: http://biddulphmuseum.com/index.html Flooding - Marsh Green gets it's name from a long history of flooding. The glacial alluvial valley floor is an area for subsidence even without the help of the many mines close to the area and the existence of a large underground reservoir at our end of the valley that is the reason for there being less pit shafts this end. Access - Marsh Green road is a single track, dangerous to the many pedestrians that have to cross it daily on their way to the old railway line (Biddulph Valley Way - Route 55) and cars that face meeting on the sharp blind bend next to Suttons old farm. Marsh Green Road was at it's safest when it was blocked off at the sewage works entrance to facilitate work on the bridge over the brook. BD087 - has had a history of severe flooding. The field is boggy during the Winter and Spring with signs of subsidence. Despite this it was part of the old Medieval Biddulph village due to it's proximity to the brook, which would have been considerably smaller then. Biddulph brook today regularly gets charged with raw sewage, it gets it's extra volume currently by taking the constant discharge from processed sewage: it is categorically 'unfit for human consumption'. During the Summer the field is home to local cattle, it regularly hosts wild life. The field provides a pleasant buffer zone between the houses on Congleton Road and the houses and sewage works to the rear.	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO754	Mr Paul Malkin				Object	Save Biddulphs Green Belt Firstly I would again like to comment that the Councils marketing of this consultation has been extremely poor, it has been left to residents associations and concerned residents to spread the bad news in their community. As council tax notices were sent to all residents a few weeks prior to the consultation starting then I would have expected the promotion of an important issue like this to have been included in that delivery. I feel SMDC have missed a real opportunity to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to produce a North Staffordshire plan that could deliver the required housing whilst protecting green belt and identifying brownfield sites to continue to regenerate the area. When I asked if this had been considered at the Biddulph consultation meeting the council officer advised me that this had not been considered as "nobody wants to live in Stoke". I find this attitude from a council officer pretty appalling and if this is the attitude of the planning team then no wonder an innovative partnership approach had not been considered. Stoke have been successfully regenerating and redeveloping brownfield sites in the area for many years and I believe SMDC could learn a lot from their approach. In addition Stoke and Newcastle are where the job opportunities are being created and many residents of Staffordshire Moorlands will travel there for work and leisure and probably would want to live in these areas. The proposed sites for development are not only in green belt areas, but also along the boundaries of existing residents. The sites are going to have a detrimental impact on current council tax payers of the district who purchased properties at an inflated rate due to overlooking beautiful open fields. These residents are not only going to lose their beautiful views but also thousands of pounds from the value of their homes. I propose a number of sites that will have a minimal impact on the green belt and current residents. The Mills in Station Road and Walley Street are in desperate need of repair or regeneration. These could either be developed into apartments for young first time buyers or older persons or demolished and new properties built. This accommodation is far better situated close to the town centre and will keep the area more in keeping of the newer properties around them. There is also old brownfield land available either side of Congleton Road in Knypersley, the former Victoria Colliery site and the land behind Bemersley recycling centre off Childerplay Road. All of these sites have much better access to the main roads than the proposed sites that are all reliant on single track country lanes. What is required locally is housing to meet the needs of local people, there are key issues to address, young people can not get onto the housing ladder and have to resort to renting that can cost more than mortgage payments and there is an ageing population that require housing to meet their needs. What I would expect the	• The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. • See response to PO131 regarding developing sites in Stoke instead. • See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO496 regarding property values. • Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. • See response to PO131 regarding Education and Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • It is agreed that affordable housing is needed locally – need thorough research as to what is needed – SHMA! Site BD087 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes so will contribute to this need. • See response to PO131 regarding highways. • See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of sewage works.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						planning department to complete before any development plans are signed off is a thorough research project to identify what is actually required locally, what is affordable to the local community and what the mix of starter homes, shared ownership and social rent homes should be. The Housing and Planning Bill has recently been passed and this includes the development of starter homes for first time buyers as part of the affordable housing requirement. These homes can be for sale up to £250,000 outside of London. Local salaries of young first time buyers would not make these affordable, SMDC must ensure that affordable homes to purchase are for sale at a price that local people can afford. The type of houses that are required should also be researched, surely the requirement is for smaller affordable homes, 1 bed apartments for singles and couples and older people to downsize to and then 2 and 3 bed homes for young families. I also made a freedom of information request to the district council with regard to the recent development at Uplands Mill in Biddulph asking for the breakdown of owner occupation, shared ownership and social housing and how many nominations had been made for local people to the social landlord, unfortunately this has not been provided in time for me to include this within this response. The reason I made this request was to be able to identify if there was a need for social housing in Biddulph or if the housing association had to widen its search for tenants to the north west, which I believe to be the case. In addition to the above, the below comments are why I feel the proposed sites should be reconsidered. Highway - too narrow, single vehicle for most of Marsh Green Road and Well Lane. At the junction with Congleton Road the carriage way is raised in both directions making it extremely difficult to see fast moving traffic coming either way. Congleton Road to Stoke gets congested and backs up at Knypersley lights and Chell roundabout, this will get worse with other developments so residents will naturally take the lanes towards Gillow Heath and up to Mow Cop and Harrishead. These lanes are single tracks with blind bends, where the road widens in Gillow Heath parked cars make it difficult to pass and the bus currently has problems getting through. Pedestrians use this lane with no pavement going to cycle track and children going to school and numerous properties in Marsh Green Road lead directly onto road, any increased traffic will make these roads dangerous and put users of them more at risk. Construction traffic will also find these areas increasingly difficult to navigate. Environment - after heavy rainfall there is often smells from the sewerage plant and it is known to overflow into the stream. Following heavy rain Marsh Green Road is like a river for many hours with water flowing from the fields, should this water be caught in the drainage system the sewage works will be constantly overflowing. The sewerage works is already servicing more	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						properties than it is designed to. Schools - as there are currently not enough first school places for children that live in the area, I assume the schools will be built first before any housing development. As a new first school is to be built has a review taken place to ensure that there will be places at the local middle and high schools to accommodate these additional children, or are class sizes going to increase resulting in a drop in educational standards?	
PO2706	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	In particular, BD087 will need to be assessed before being taken further. A level 2 assessment will be required.	The site boundary has been amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site if it is selected.
PO4636	Mrs Wendy Boothroyd				Object	I do not think these areas are suitable for housing for the following reasons: Access Marshgreen Road is a narrow road in some places less than 10feet. With steep banks and in one part it is single track with a very sharp blind bend leading to a narrow bridge which crosses the cycle tracks. An increase in traffic would be very hazardous to people walking the tracks. Also this round is not suitable for heavy vehicles. There is no street lighting which makes it very dangerous for the children walking to school. Landscape The land between Portland Drive there is a deep gully which was once a water course. This has been culverted but when it rains heavily it still floods. Local knowledge is that the land in this area is unstable due to shifting sand which would make it unsuitable for housing. Flood Plain The land adjacent to Biddulph Brook, and again particularly the level of the Brook rises causes flooding issues. When I moved here my insurer could not transfer my insurance because the post code flagged up as a flood risk area. Housing being built nearer the Brook could possibly find themselves un insurable as company's now ask if your 100 meters of a water course, Sewage Works The sewage works is screened by trees for part of the year, but during the Winter Months is quite visible. Housing in this area would have a clear view if the metal structure, and quite often when work is being carried out large floodlights are used. Also the noise when the pumps are going is obtrusive in Portland Drive, also the smell on occasion is very offensive so property nearer would even more inconveniences which could become an environment issue. A spokesperson for United Utilities made the following statement by letter dated 26 th May 2016: We have identified the need for the local planning authority to discuss any new housing near to the waste water treatment works with their Environment Health colleagues, and give the sites very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that may be available to them. Our position is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing of the borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a waste water treatment works. Green Belt The	- See response to PO131 regarding highways. - See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. - Screening of the sewage works would be required as part of any development on the site. - See Council response to United Utilities (top of this table) - See response to PO131 regarding Education. - See response to PO131 regarding amenity issues. - See response to PO131 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						government have emphasised the importance of Green Belt in preserving communities in their areas. These sites form a natural barrier with Gillow Heath and if these sites plus others were developed semi-rural areas would be engulfed and densely populated suburb without Green spaces will be formed. Infrastructure Development on this site would fall into the catchment area for Woodhouse Middle School, and Oxhay School, both schools are always well subscribed and therefore maybe unable to cope with a large intake. Also the junction on Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road has very poor visibility and increase in traffic would make the junction more hazardous and dangerous. Amenity The properties adjacent to the Green Belt in Portland Drive are all single story dwellings, and regulations state that new development should be in keeping with these properties. If this is the case then development on this land could only consist of single storey dwelling's as loss of light and privacy would be an issue to existing properties. Additional Sites As Brownfield sites are supposed to be the preferred option, there is a large area of the properly restored former Victoria Colliery on Brown Lees Road. Also there is a large area of land east of the main road on Childerplay Lane. These two sites could hold the entire Biddulph allocation with very little impact on existing residents with ready access to main road and bus services.	
PO5069	Mr Paul Kasperowicz				Object	Planned development of 25 new builds on land North of Marsh Green Road, East of the Biddulph Brook and backing on to the houses on Congleton Road. Historical note - BD087 was considered in the 1980's as a new Cemetery Ground for Biddulph. This Planning proposal was rejected by the Biddulph Planning Group due to both access issues and flood risk. BD087 is clearly constrained - there are four major planning factors to be considered together with the sustainable and viability of this site as a stand-alone build. 1. BD087 is within the Green Belt Core strategy - Only in exceptional circumstances should the Green Belt be used. The Green Belt Report (Parcel N7) commissioned by SMDC contains all the land in the Marsh Green Area. The report states that this land has a Significant Contribution - in preventing neighbouring towns (Biddulph & Congleton) merging into one another. The report states development in this locality would quickly give the impression of a connection between the settlements - the report further states - The parcel complements Green Belt land within Cheshire East. This report also states that Eastern Boundary is Complex - this is the boundary along Congleton Road. (Complex means - It has many different elements which therefore makes it more difficult to understand or interpret) and that development would produce an over extended linear pattern with limited relationship to Biddulph Town. This site is Approximately 1.5 Miles from the town centre. The Green Belt report clearly states that	• See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding highways. • See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. • See Council response to United Utilities (top of this table) • See response to PO131 regarding amenity issues. • No contradiction with SMDC Core Strategy Policy SS5b 'Biddulph Area Strategy'. Sites within the urban area and an extension to the urban area are included as well as extensions in the Green Belt identified as part of the Green Belt Review as stated in the policy. • See response to PO131 regarding Education. • See response to PO496 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						this land which contains BD 087 has a Significant Contribution in Biddulph's Green Belt. The Green Belt report states that there is Land in the immediate vicinity of Biddulph Moor which is less sensitive, being on a plateau. 2. Access to the Site The entrance to BD 087 will be via Marsh Green Road (Confirmed by SMDC Future Planning) the new road will then turn right off Marsh Green Road, then right again over Biddulph Brook - a new bridge will be constructed over Biddulph Brook, then the road will sweep uphill towards Congleton Road before turning North back down to the Brook. There will be a proposed nature band next to the stream. 1. There is no current access to BD087 - this will have to be created. Please Note - The Staffordshire Moorlands Planning office has stated there will be No compulsory purchase of land by the council. 2. BD087 is to consist of a proposed 25 new builds - assuming 2 cars/new build, plus 10 visitors/day and 10 delivery vans this puts an additional road usage of about 140 extra journeys onto Marsh Green Road in daylight hours, approximately 20 vehicles/hour or double the current usage on a single track road. In otherwords traffic controls would be required to control the traffic flow. (Please Note - this is not taking into consideration the potential development of BD 068 - 70 Builds, 140 vehicles, 30 visitors, 30 delivery vans, total 400 journeys. 50 extra vehicles/hour - now 4 times the current usage! 3. Marsh Green Road is 90% a single track road - Entrance via Congleton Road is 5.3M wide reducing to 4.0M after Portland Drive, after the proposed new entrance to BD087, Marsh Green Road reduces to 2.5M (non useable to heavy construction vehicles / trucks). Therefore there is one way in and one way out of this site for construction vehicles. 4. From the entrance to Portland Drive to the proposed new entrance to BD087, Marsh Green Road will have to be extensively widened approximately by 2.5M (from 4.4M/ 4.0M to 6.9M this includes road widening plus a new footpath of 1.8M from the proposed site to Portland Drive the nearest pavement), a new retaining wall will also be required to prevent land slippage from neighbouring field (this could be shifting sand). Unfortunately the existing Bridge (3.9M) over Biddulph Brook cannot be extended and therefore will remain as a single track Bridge due to the approach angle being 30 degrees to the entering roads. A new footpath will have to be created over Biddulph Brook on Marsh Green Road. 5. The widening of Marsh Green Road to support BD087 would also need to address Road surface water issues and Street Lighting (There is No current street lighting in this area) - This area is currently a dark zone and therefore low level light would be needed to retain the current darkness levels. Switch off times would also be good for this area. 6. Please note to support the proposed new build on BD087 the above work will have to be completed before the building works could start (to prevent major traffic issues - vehicles	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						backing onto Congleton Road) - This may require Marsh Green Road being closed for a period of time. Compensation maybe required by existing users, this is the Builders issue. 7. The access to the site on the Western side of Biddulph Brook will be built on both Category 3 & Category 2 Flood Risk Areas (The approximate height of the proposed access road above Biddulph Brook at this point would be 1.5M. These access road will require substantial foundations to avoid future sinkage). These High Risk Flood areas are indicated on Environmental Agency Map 388.801Y. BD087 currently contains 3 High Risk Flood areas. Please Note - there are a further 10 High Risk Flood areas identified on Biddulph Brook before the boundary with Congleton. Major infrastructure including surface water drainage and street lighting would have to be built in/on these areas. 8. The Environmental Agency and United Utilities have both stated (in writing) that - If another site in the Biddulph or Biddulph Moor area was available that does not have a Flood Risk, then these sites should be considered first before BD087. Please also see Staffordshire Moorlands Future Planning Core Strategy and Government Guidelines. I do not believe that the Staffordshire Moorlands Core strategy is being followed. 9. A new bridge would have to be built to support access to this site. Due to the narrow width of the land on the Western side of Biddulph Brook and the necessity to provide the necessary turning circles for both 28 and 44 ton vehicles this bridge would have to be at a diagonal angle to the Brook. This bridge (approximately 6.0M wide) would need to take the loading for a 44 Ton Truck. This bridge would require substantial foundations - This site is called Marsh Green, it is Marsh Land - can this land actually provide the necessary foundation for a Bridge this size? I would strongly suggest that before any Planning Permission is given to develop this site that core samples are taken to ensure that a Bridge and its foundations could actually be built. The Environment Agency has confirmed it will not allow the Brook to have a culvert. 10. The actual site proposal of 25 new builds will require parking for 50 to 60 vehicles plus 10 visitors spaces and a large turn around at the Northern end of the site to accommodate a turning circle for a 28 Ton fixed axle Truck - the site is a dead end. It is possible that more than 20% of the site land area would be taken up in providing the necessary road system to support the site. 11. The Road system on the site will require Surface water drainage and a retention tank, (this is not possible in the High Risk Flood areas - Surface water would have to be directly drained into the brook) Surface water (which could include car washing) will require filtering before it enters Biddulph Brook. Due to the topography nature of the site Two Surface Water retaining tanks would be required - one in the Southern end of the site (this could be a problem as the High Risk	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Flood Area Category 3/2 extends onto this site by at least 25M). United Utilities has a requirement that the Surface Water Drainage system is not located on a Flood Risk Area. The Northern part of this site is on a High Risk Flood Area which extends onto this site by 15M. Therefore the Road system and Drainage system would have to stop short of both the Southern & Northern part of this site - reducing the potential house numbers. 12. Street lighting would be required - but this is a Dark area - Please Note that Bats feed in this area and lighting would need to be kept to a minimum to protect the existing environment, wildlife and nature requirements. As there is no existing access available to this site - BD087 will require substantial infrastructure development to both existing roads (Marsh Green Road) and in providing new access roads and bridges. Can the potential of 15 new builds (see later notes) support these costs? Is this site viable? Before granting Planning Permission a fully costed out business plan with contingency should be presented to the Staffordshire Moorlands Future Planning clearly identifying all associated infrastructure costs. 3. Site Constraints BD087 site location relative to the Water treatment plant. The Water Treatment Works 100M to the South and 15M higher. The Sewage Works is 225M to the South and 20M higher - compared to the Northern end of this site. Due to the topographical nature of the site there are a number of major planning constraints. 1. United Utilities position on BD087 - The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the Borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works. United Utilities also state in their letter - the sites (BD087,062 and 068) need very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that maybe available to them. 2. Site Sewage system - The sewage from BD087 will have to be pumped back to the Sewage works approximately a distance of 400M to the South, the site at the Northern end is 20M below the sewage works. United Utilities has stated in writing - we would expect the houses and associated road systems to be located outside the area of highest flood risk nearest to the Brook as this is a requirement of planning policy. As a result, if a pumping station is required, we are hopeful the pumping station would be located within the residential development, therefore, outside an area of high flood risk. 3. Septic tank overflow from properties on Congleton Road, to the Eastern side of the site - From 161 Congleton Road to 165 Congleton Road - sewage water is piped into a septic tank located at the bottom of 167 Congleton Road the existing pipework requires 2M access to the Northern end of the site - I am told that there is a legal agreement in place, this needs to be confirmed before any Planning Permission is given. 4. BD 087 is completely over-looked	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						- therefore any new builds will have to take this into consideration and demonstrate this will not become a major issue after the properties are built and sold. Example the properties on Congleton Road are 10M above the site and therefore look directly down into the site, any potential new owners privacy concerns must be addressed at the planning stage. 5. Loss of Light to existing properties - due to the topography of the site the plan to build the new builds on the Eastern side of the valley will mean there will be loss of light to existing properties - The Staffordshire Moorlands Planning Department should look to keep the loss of light to existing properties to an absolute minimum, this needs to be addressed at the planning stage - A reasonable distance should be determined between the existing boundaries and any new builds to avoid the loss of light. 6. Existing Boundary considered - Boundaries need to be maintained and therefore access will be required. Please note - there is a right of way to the Southern end of the Site that will also have to be maintained by the Biddulph Council. 4. Environment Issues 1. BD087 - Environmental Agency considerations. This site has 3 Major Flood Risk areas identified by the Environmental Agency. The Staffordshire Moorlands Planning Departments Core Principles - stated that no Flood Risk Land in Category 3,2 or 1 should be built on if there is other land available in the area! In other words this states all other non Flood Risk sites should be first reviewed before a Flood Risk site is considered. Judging by the evidence summated in both the Green Belt Report and the potential sites recognized in the first Staffordshire Moorlands Site Review and by the Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Committee this is clearly not the case. 2. The Green Belt Report clearly states that there is ample opportunity to develop sites in the Biddulph Moor area without major impact on the Green Belt. The Staffordshire Moorlands First Sites Review identified sites in Pennine Way, Biddulph Moor and Gillow Heath. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Committee has identified several possible sites in the Biddulph area that should be considered before BD087. Government Guidelines also confirm that all other sites should be considered first before sites on a Flood Risk Area. I believe a full review of sites in the Biddulph and Biddulph Moor areas is necessary before BD087 is confirmed and/or is granted Planning Permission. 3. The Environment Agency requested at the last Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Site Consultation in September 2015 that BD087 had a Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA completed before Planning Permission was granted. The Environment Agency confirmed that a Level 2 SFRA would have a major effect on any final plans for New Builds on this site. 4. The Environmental Agency also stated that if the site added to any potential flooding down-stream (10 Major Flood Risk areas between BD087 and the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						boundary with Congleton) then the Agency would strongly object to this site. 5. United Utilities confirm that other sites should be considered before this site, not only due to the Flood Risk and surface water issues but also the locality of the site to the existing Water Treatment Works and the effects that any potential future expansion of the Works would both have on the site in terms of odour and noise, but also increased water flow from the Sewage Works into the Biddulph Brook due to the new builds proposed for the Biddulph area. Potentially causing additional flooding to this site. 5. Sustainability of this site 1. BD 087 is 2 Km from Biddulph town centre - The Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy is to support the development of Biddulph Town Centre - this site does not fit within the Core Strategy - Why is it being considered? 2. The nearest Bus stop is over 1000 M away - there is no Bus service to this area, therefore, the only means of transport is via a Car. This will add more strain onto the parking problems in Biddulph Town Centre. 3. The nearest primary School to this site is Ox Hay (which is full to capacity) this school is nearly 1.5 Km from this site and Children would have to cross a major traffic route Congleton Road (1200 vehicles/hour). I would suggest that if the Staffordshire Moorlands Council decide to go ahead with BD087 they also instruct a Traffic Light system at the Junction of Marsh Green Road and Congleton Road estimated cost 256,000 pounds - this can be paid for by the Builder of the site. 4. Potential flooding of the Access Road - From the Environment Agency Maps it is clear that the proposed access road not only has the potential to be systemically flooded but could also be washed away (The road foundations will be critical in preventing any washing away of the road or sinkage of the Road. I would suggest core samples are taken to assess the type and depth of the foundations required to support heavy trucks on this road) - there is no other access to this site. How will the Staffordshire Moorlands Council handle this problem? 6. Viability of Stand-alone Site 1. The infrastructure Costs associated with this site will run into the millions - Widening of Marsh Green Road, Retaining Wall and New pavement on Marsh Green Road, New Foot Bridge over Biddulph Brook, New access road built on Category 3 Flood Plain, New Bridge over Biddulph Brook & Traffic Lights on Congleton Road. Not a complete list just a flavour of the Major Project this stand-alone site is. 2. The Site has 3 Major Flood Zones and this will restrict the New Build to an estimated 15 houses. The costs associated with building these houses and infrastructure to support the build would put these properties costs at over 350,000 pounds each, to balance the costs. Clearly this is not affordable housing. 3. As 30% of these new builds will be Social Housing it is not possible to create a viable cost effective project. Question who will pick up this bill? Does the Staffordshire Moorlands Council have a	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						viable costed out plan for this site with contingency built in? If this site is Not a viable site why is it being considered? 4. The Biddulph Local Plan states for BD087 - The Council evidence demonstrates a need for affordable housing in Biddulph and this is reflected in local policy(set out in the Core Strategy) Building housing in access of 350,000 pounds is not providing affordable housing. This site does not have the capacity to provide affordable housing! Summary 1. The Green Belt Report (Parcel N7) commissioned by SMDC contains all the land in the Marsh Green Area. The report states that this land has a Significant Contribution - in preventing neighbouring towns (Biddulph & Congleton) merging into one another. 2. The Green Belt report clearly states that this land which contains BD 087 has a Significant Contribution in Biddulph's Green Belt. 3. The Environmental Agency and United Utilities have both stated (in writing) that - If another site in the Biddulph or Biddulph Moor area was available, that does not have a Flood Risk, then these sites should be considered first before BD087. 4. United Utilities also state in their letter - the sites (BD087,062 and 068) need very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that maybe available. 5. The Staffordshire Moorlands Planning Departments Core Principles - stated that no Flood Risk Land in Category 3,2 or 1 should be built on if there is other land available in the area! Judging by the evidence summated in both the Green Belt Report and the potential sites recognized in the first Staffordshire Moorlands Site Review and by the Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Committee this is clearly not the case. 6. The Staffordshire Moorlands Planning Department First Sites Review identified sites in Pennine Way, Biddulph Moor and Gillow Heath. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Committee has identified several possible sites in the Biddulph area that should be considered before BD087. Government Guidelines also confirm that all other sites should be considered first before sites on a Flood Risk Area. I believe a full review of sites in the Biddulph and Biddulph Moor areas is necessary before BD087 is confirmed and/or is granted Planning Permission. 7. The Environment Agency requested at the last Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Site Consultation in September 2015 that BD087 had a Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA completed before Planning Permission was granted. This site is called Marsh Green, it is Marsh Land - can this land actually provide the necessary foundation to support a Bridge which will carry a 44 Ton Vehicle or for that matter housing? The Site needs to be fully surveyed before any planning permission is granted. 8. The Environmental Agency has stated that if this site added to any potential flooding down-stream then the Agency would strongly object to this site. 9. The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet the housing needs of the	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Borough, it would be more appropriate to identify new housing sites that are not close to a wastewater treatment works. United Utilities also state in their letter - the sites (BD087,062 and 068) need very careful consideration when comparing these sites with potential alternative sites that maybe available to them. 10. BD087 will require substantial infrastructure development to both existing roads (Marsh Green Road) and in providing new access roads and bridges. Can the potential of 15 new builds (see later notes) support these costs? Is this site actually viable? 11. The Site has 3 Major Flood Zones and together with infrastructure restrictions would restrict the New Build to an estimated 15 houses. The costs associated with building these houses and infrastructure to support the build would put these properties costs at over 350,000 pounds each, to balance the costs. Clearly this is not affordable housing. This site does not have the capacity to provide affordable housing! 12. BD087 has a number of Right of Access to be resolved before Planning Permission is given. An Example - Septic tank overflow from properties on Congleton Road pass through BD087 (for the past 45 years) - There is an existing legal agreement. 13. BD 087 is completely over-looked - therefore any new builds will have to take this into consideration, any potential new owners privacy concerns must be addressed at the planning stage. 14. Not discussed in the above letter is the ecological importance of this site. In the Biddulph Local Plan it states - the sites proximity to a heritage assets and an LNR is likely to have a negative effect as could the sites district ecological importance. Before any planning permission is granted this site deserves a fully ecological study to be completed. I am not the person to write on this subject, I can only ask that the Staffordshire Moorlands Planning Department review this request. I thank you for your time in reviewing this letter and would ask for a written response.	
PO4617	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	BD087 - Major access issues. Other concerns with noise and smell, not recommended for inclusion.	• See response to PO131 regarding highways. • See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works.
PO5727	Mrs Eileen Smith				Object	I object due to highway safety implications.	• See response to PO131 regarding highways.
PO6265	Mr N Lunt				Object	This site is currently considered as a Green Belt. The land here is subject to flooding and access roads are completely unsuitable.	• See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7225	Mr B Roberts				Object	Northern plots – York Close, Marsh Green, Portland Drive. These developments are very close to the sewerage works. Problems remain with proximity and also capacity and space available for any possible need for expansion of the sewerage works.	See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works.
PO6684 PO9010	Mr Chris Heath Mrs Susan Heath				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Highways/Access/Infrastructure There is no capacity to support works traffic as Marsh Green Road is a narrow Lane. There is a risk to person and property from works traffic and increased volume of traffic on the inadequate access highways following development. No access to local retail without car travel due to lack of pavements on Marsh Green Road, therefore additional impact on inadequate highways infrastructure. The proposal would create a severe risk of accident. The access to the site would be either through Beaumont Close or Marsh Green Close both routes would intersect a public path. Planning policies should protect public rights of way and by putting a road into the planned housing estate would endanger pedestrians. The junction spacing's and convergence at Congleton Road are below highways design guidelines. (Standard = 40m opposite and 80m adjacent). The development contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1 "Ensuring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development." Schools Current schools are at capacity. Increased development will cause increased traffic around schools - highway safety. Children's education would suffer. Jobs Query why extra housing is needed. Empty shops in town centre. There are no more jobs being created in the town. People moving into new developments therefore need to commute making Biddulph no more than a dormitory town. With the Stoke area being the obvious local source of work, all these cars would commute south, so why build at the north of Biddulph? It would make more sense to build the housing in the areas where it is really needed- where there are jobs, and where there are brownfield sites. Scale of development The figures given for population growth are provided nationally not locally and therefore do not necessarily adequately reflect the population growth or the requirements of Biddulph. Social Housing It is evidenced that mixed developments have a negative impact on communities, especially where people have paid large amounts of money for a property to be living next to properties where anti-social behaviour is taking place. Unfortunately due to housing associations allocations policies, mixed communities do not work, the problems being experienced at Uplands Mill is a local example of this. Sewerage Works Odour from sewage treatment works can have a detrimental impact on the quality of the local environment for those living close. The amount of waste the plant at	- See response to PO131 regarding Highways. - See response to PO131 regarding Education. - The proportion of 20% of the District's housing development taking place in Biddulph has been through extensive consultation and public examination as it is taken from the Council's Core Strategy which was adopted in March 2014. - See response to PO754 regarding use of brownfield sites in Biddulph. - Provision of affordable housing is enshrined in Government policy. - See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. - See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO5069 regarding exceptional circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt - See response to PO131 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. - See response to PO131 regarding landscape impact. - See response to PO496 regarding ecology. - See response to PO496 regarding heritage impact. - The land is privately owned.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						this site can take is already at capacity, this the only sewage works in Biddulph designed with a capacity of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892) and now with the extra waste from the new development "Uplands Mill" to deal with. This is evidenced by historic Sewage Flooding (extract below). Further development will increase the occurrence of sewer flooding. The issue of odour is only one of the side effects of the plant. DEFRA states that no matter how modern these plants are there will always be the excretion of gas and chemicals into the environment. The tanker lorry already collects twice a day to empty, how many times a day will the extra housing force the tanker down Marsh Green Lane, it will cause a higher level of disruption when combined with the additional resident traffic on a road that is not built to cope, simply it won't be safe. Floodplain Summary of flood issues/Objections: The site has a history of flooding. Increased development will increase run off, increasing flood risk. The site acts as an area to accept run off waters from A527. Loss of this will exacerbate flood impact directly. Unacceptable risk of development works contamination due to run off in to waterway (Biddulph Brook) would be inevitable due to the proximity of the proposed development. Unacceptable risk of waterway contamination following development from household use. The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 where development proposed... "will be guided to first make use of areas at no or low risk of flooding before areas at higher risk." The presence of a wet meadow evidences the current high level of surface water runoff the site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. Greenbelt This site is Greenbelt land that should be protected with brownfield sites considered a priority, the Government imply that greenbelt is still to be protected so the Brownfield sites should be considered a priority. There are empty mills close to the town center that could be utilised/re-developed. Also several brown fields sites such as the Old Victoria Colliery site or land of Childerplay Road. The National Planning Policy Framework States that the environmental role should contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use of natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy, this development would result in completely the opposite. Wildlife This area is rich in wildlife with	

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Buzzards, Barn owls, Little owls, Ducks, Herons, Frogs, Toads and Newts often seen on this proposed site, Bats are commonly seen feeding above the field at twilight, all of which would be destroyed by the development. The site has been used for recreation, children, dog walking and wildlife research for many years.	
PO6737	Mr Michael Martin				Object	Object to BD087 - site is TOTALLY unsuitable for development. ALL of these sites are within metres of a full to capacity sewerage works already working to overcapacity. We regularly have sewage smells, the nightly warring of machinery, and when walking in the adjacent fields have seen evidence of sewage overflow. The health limitations are obvious. The lane leading to BD087 is one cars width, no footpath, houses adjoining the lane have their own boundaries right up to the lane. Many years ago my wife and I together with numerous neighbours attended a site meeting at the actual works and were told by a United Utilities area manager that the houses in Portland Drive, York Close, and Long Valley Road should never have been built..... we register our total objections to this area. The preferred area was the old Victoria Colliery that has been totally reclaimed and is ready to use.	- See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See response to PO131 regarding highways. - See response to PO131 regarding Victoria Colliery as an alternative location for development.
PO7577	Mr Peter Turner				Object	(Summary only) Object on the basis of: Public Health / Proximity to Sewage Works Sewage works is over capacity, residents already experience unacceptable levels of amenity such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. Contradicts Core Strategy Policy SD4. During heavy periods of rainfall sewerage system cannot cope with existing levels of development and overflows. United Utilities have expressed a preference that the Council does not locate new development next to the sewage works. Green Belt & Flood Risk Site is flood zone 2 and its release would contradict Core Strategy Policy SD4. Highways Local highway network is inadequate to cope with new development. Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road bend radii are too small. There are two pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. Serious Highways incidents are common place at the junction of Mow Lane, Congleton Road, Smithy Lane and Halls Road. Recent accident at 4.30am (outside of high risk high flow traffic times) on 20/5/16 relating to the Mow Lane junction with Congleton Road resulted in lane closures, traffic restrictions and spillage intervention by the fire authority. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF Core Strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban extension land to the west of the	- See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See Council response to United Utilities (top of this table). - See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. - See response to PO131 regarding highways. - See response to PO5069 regarding contradiction with Core Strategy Policy SS5b.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						bypass and where developments help secure infrastructure improvements for the benefit of the newly developed part of the town.	
PO8318	Mr A Hague				Object	Site has poor access to main road A527. Would spoil green belt which i feel would spoil nice area of Biddulph Question who would choose to live any nearer to a sewage works than the houses in Marsh Green Road and Portland Drive We can occasionally hear noise from the sewage works at night. The odour has improved since 1980s but we still get smells occasionally Preferred Sites The Old Victoria Colliery Land off Childerplay Road Mills close to town centre. All have good access to A527 Would not spoil green belt question why spoil green belt and spoil what we have in Biddulph.	- See response to PO131 regarding highways. - See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. - See response to PO131 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. - See response to PO754 regarding use of derelict mills in Biddulph.
PO9050	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				Object	(Agent - G. Willard) Object to inclusion of this site.	Comment noted.
PO9037	The Hart Family				Object	Rob Duncan (agent) Whilst it is acknowledged that this site is well contained and will round-off existing development in this location, it is a very small site with limited capacity for development (up to 25 dwellings). As such it does not present opportunities for significant improvements to local infrastructure. There are also significant issues in respect of this site from a highway safety perspective. The Local Highway Authority confirms that development of this site would necessitate the provision of 2.4m x 90m visibility splays at the junction of Beaumont Road onto Marsh Green Road. Crucially however, it is not possible to achieve these visibility splays without including third party land. There is no evidence to suggest that the relevant third parties are in agreement to provide these splays and accordingly there is not an appropriate means of access into this site. As such this sit should not be taken forward as a preferred option. A fair proportion of the site also lies within the Flood Plain, as confirmed by Environment Agency mapping. New housing development should be targeted to areas outside of the flood plain in the first instance, and it is submitted that my client's sites (BD067a, BD067b and BD067c) are sequentially preferable in this regard. Site BD087 should therefore not be taken forward as a housing allocation within the Submission Version of the Site Allocations DPD.	- See response to PO131 regarding highways. - See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2.
PO9226	Mr Peter Wilshaw				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) The development of future Housing and any future Solar Farm installation would squeeze the natural life from the valley. It would deplete the Green Belt and detrimentally and dramatically alter the landscape and negatively affect the wellbeing of the people of Biddulph and in particular Gillow	- See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. - See response to PO5069 regarding exceptional circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt. - See response to PO131 regarding landscape impact. - See response to PO131 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
						Heath. I hope that planners will reconsider the preferred option taking into account the following; Unsuitable road network . These proposed housing sites are situated along the gateways to our countryside and walking tracks e.g. Akesmore Lane, Holy Lane, Mow Lane and Marshgreen Road. These narrow roads already carry an unacceptable level of traffic which when combined with a heavy footfall of walkers with children and animals presents a real danger. This danger is also manifested in the fact that they all lead to crossroads on the A527 at Marshgreen and Smithy Lane which are difficult places to emerge from. If these lanes require widening or other safety upgrade it highly likely the ancient hedgerows will be destroyed and therefore the characteristics of that landscape lost for ever. Situating parking places at various spots on the west side of the valley at medium to high elevation would enable access to many walking tracks and elevate the mix of cars and people on the narrow lanes. Diminishing of the Green Belt in the short and long term. The release of Green Belt land, according to the NPPF, should only take place in “exceptional circumstances”. There is not statement to say what those circumstances are and why land can be released in Biddulph and other places but, not in Leek? Cumulative and Visual damage to the historic and characteristics of the north Staffordshire uplands area of Gillow Heath . Biddulph valley is also a gateway to the moorlands and The Peak District National Park. It was granted the title of “The Garden Town of Staffordshire” and over twenty years of volunteer effort to showcase the town, Biddulph in Bloom Charity has won many RHS Heart of England in Bloom awards and in 2015 came second in the National Large Town category. I feel that the location and magnitude of these developments will adversely affect the confidence, so hard fought for, in the effort to improve our town and increase tourism. Sites BD062, BD068 and BD087 are unsuitable areas to build houses being adjacent to a water treatment plant and the Biddulph Brook. In many respects this plan does not meet the Core Strategy of SMDC and SCC in meeting their own obligations stated in the Historical Environment Assessment Report which is to protect and retain the character of the landscape and follow and develop many of the recommendation therein. There is a finite limit to the availability of land on which to build houses and the limit to where the wellbeing and recreation of the population is detrimentally affected. The County’s Historic Environment Assessment demonstrates that this area has historic value in terms of heritage and historic landscape character.	• See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO496 regarding heritage impact.
PO9965	Mr C Lunt				Object	The land has flooding issues. Access would be an issue.	• See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding highways.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10227	Mr Graeme Court				Object	Summary only (see full representation attached). Object to the allocation of this site due to the following reasons: 1) It would prioritise building in the floodplain. The land acts as a natural soakaway for rainwater. 2) site is next to the Water Treatment Works where there are issues of odour and noise 3) during periods of heavy rain, the sewers cannot cope and raw sewage is admitted to drains in Marsh Green Road finding its way into Biddulph Brook. Development would exacerbate this and would be contrary to adopted Core Strategy SD4. 4) The land is currently used for grazing 5) it would damage the amenity value of this part of Biddulph 6) the site is in the Green Belt and there are other sites available for development. 7) site is a conduit for diverse wildlife. The Phase 1 survey stated that other surveys needed to be carried out. 8) March Green Road is a very dangerous road. Further development would exacerbate problems here. This would be contrary to Core Strategy T1. 9) The capacity of the water treatments works is insufficient. More recently Biddulph NT gardens have agreed that their waste can now go via the works which will make things worse.	• See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO496 regarding ecology. • See response to PO131 regarding highways.
PO10074	Ms Heather Mason				Object	(Summary of comments) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892); Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding; Loss of Green Belt - no exceptional circumstances demonstrated; The site is in Flood Zone 2; Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC Highways Design Guide Policy; Access for emergency vehicles; This site will deliver too few homes to add a measurable contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Staffordshire Highways have already responded to our protests to say the road infrastructure is not suitable; therefore more housing would bring more cars, more danger, more noise, and more pollution. There are no bus routes on this lane for the reason of unsuitable, therefore more housing would bring more cars more danger, more noise pollution. The natural habitat provides homes for the varied wildlife including badgers foxes bats and many different species of birds. This development would not enhance nor add any value to the quality of life of the local community.	• See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. • See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. • See response to PO5069 regarding exceptional circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt. • See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. • See response to PO131 regarding highways. • Site BD087 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • See response to PO496 regarding ecology.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10071	Mr Norman Smith				Object	(Summary of comments) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892); Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding; Noise from new development will negatively impact on existing residents; Loss of Green Belt - no exceptional circumstances demonstrated; Impact on ecology; Site is in Flood Zone 2; Inadequate road network; Emergency services access; Too few homes to bring CLIL benefits to Gillow Heath; I think this site should be included as visual or public open space within Biddulph.	● See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. ● See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. ● See response to PO5069 regarding exceptional circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt. ● See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. ● See response to PO131 regarding highways. ● Site BD087 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. ● See response to PO496 regarding ecology. ● The land is privately owned so cannot be designated as Public Open Space. The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016). Local Green Space supersedes the Visual Open Space designation (which is an old designation not supported by Government policy in the NPPF).
PO10202	Mr Carl Mason				Object	Strongly object to Preferred Option site BD087: NPPF states that environmental role should contribute to protecting and enhancing natural, built and historic environment and..help to improve biodiversity [etc] the overbearing scale of works would have oppressive impact on the surrounding area and existing houses planning policies should protect public rights of way and by putting [access] road into housing estate would endanger pedestrians site is natural land with many varieties of plant and animal life. We should be conserving and enhancing the natural environment.. building on green belt land would be oppressive to Beaumont Close residents (close proximity of buildings). Loss of natural light. Also a planned site on the opposite side of Marsh Green Road. planned housing would be out of character both in design and scale we would lose privacy and visual amenity. Trees would be lost in large quantities thereby reducing carbon footprint. 25 additional houses would result in noise pollution and disturbance. Unacceptable level of intrusion in addition to [other amenity impacts]. Traffic pollution and highway safety would become dangerous; Marsh Green Road could not accommodate more traffic and does not have pavement. Beaumont Close could not accommodate through-traffic (and no pavement); turn into the cul de sac only one vehicle(wide). HGVs would cause danger and disturbance. Beaumont Close residents currently feel safe but this would be lost due to fear of crime and disorder which would undermine the quality of life of the community.	● See response to PO131 regarding noise and odour, existing raw sewage flooding, capacity of water treatment works. ● See response to PO131 regarding the Green Belt Review. ● See response to PO5069 regarding exceptional circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt. ● See response to PO131 regarding amenity issues. ● See response to PO131 regarding Flood Zone 2. ● See response to PO131 regarding highways. ● See response to PO496 regarding ecology. ● See response to PO4636 regarding site screening.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10178	Mr Robert Chambers				Object	Object.	Comment noted.
PO10087	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft						
PO10101	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding						
PO10193	Rev Lindsay Clowes						
PO10018	Mrs C Cliffe						
PO9997	Mr D Cliffe						
PO10127	Mr R Meadowcroft						
PO10113	Mrs V Whiston						
PO10044	Mr D Platt						
PO10033	Mrs E Platt						
PO10155	Mrs B						
PO9925	Rowland						
PO10139	Mrs M Harding						
PO8358	Mrs Anne						
PO8338	Young						
PO8298	Mr N Mosson						
PO8544	Mrs S Bennett						
PO8564	Mr R Cook						
PO8583	Mr D Neal						
PO8895	Mr R Scales						
PO7878	Mrs J Sailes						
PO8118	Mr M Clews						
PO7763	Mrs J Banister						
PO8412	Mr A Forrester						
PO7961	Mr R Bradbury						
PO8076	Mr G Price						
PO8964	Mr A Lehepoo						
PO8695	Mrs V Jackson						
	Mr C Goodwin						
PO8603	Mrs Joan						
PO8645	Draisey						
PO8625	Mrs R Knapper						
PO8674	Mr R Booth						
PO8715	Mrs M Booth						
PO8778	Mr A Malbon						
	Mr R Willott						
PO8793	Mr J						
PO8247	Whitehurst						
PO7721	Mr S Holdcroft						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7743	Mr P Kelly						
PO7804	Mr D Bradbury						
	Mrs E Griffiths						
PO8977	Mr R Hindmarsh						
PO7702	Mrs P Hindmarsh						
PO8921	Mr J Shelly						
PO8921	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO8940	Mr and Mrs G Bowyer						
PO8878	Mrs J.A. Bennett						
PO8739	Mr Stephen Willott						
PO8759	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8850	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO8831	Ms Philippa Swindells						
PO5057	Mrs Eileen Smith						
PO5747	Mr Christopher Slater						
PO5824	M Mitchell						
PO5652	Mr Reg Grimwood						
PO6057	Mr Jason Eardley						
PO5702	Mrs L Price						
PO6010	Mr K Davies						
PO5674	Mr R Milner						
PO5019	Mr G Boulton						
PO5046	Mr H Whalley						
PO7865	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO7901	Mr J Swindell						
PO7926	Mr D Smith						
PO8212	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7128	Mr E Hilditch						
PO7366							
PO7513							
PO7269							

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7683	Mrs L Carter						
PO7148	Mr A Weston						
PO7457	Mrs G Weston						
	Mr A Atkinson						
PO7429	Mr K						
PO7053	Flannagan						
	Mr J Banister						
PO6437	Mr and Mrs B Carter						
PO6832	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO5624	Mr D						
PO5444	Wickstead						
PO6038	Mr A Barbeard						
PO6970	Mrs K Hallam						
PO7022	Mr T Barker						
PO7002	Mr K Allen						
PO5531	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO5506	Mr R Lawton						
PO5490	Mr N Moxon						
PO6911	Mr M Cook						
PO6890	Mrs L Cook						
PO6351	Mr M Mason						
PO6144	Mr G Mason						
PO6163	Mr N Lunt						
PO6791	Mrs J Collier						
PO5723	Mr K Collier						
PO5763	Mrs A Jones						
	Mrs D Whalley						
PO5378	Mr J						
PO5978	Hammond						
PO8278	Mr S Leese						
	Mrs J Ebdon						
PO8519	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8433	Mrs Gillian						
PO7941	Flannagan						
PO8373	R Hutton						
	Mr C Kirkham						
PO8481	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						
PO8461	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO8173	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO8061	MRS ANGELA						
PO8021	Turner						
PO8039	Mr B Hyde						
PO8003	Mr N Goode						
PO7981	Mr K Parry						
PO7175	Mrs A Brown						
PO7206	Mrs C Hensor						
PO7814	Mrs G Hall						
	Mr M Seddon						
PO7845	Mr & Mrs J &						
PO8500	A Twigg						
PO8384	Miss L Siddorn						
PO8159	Miss L Delves						
	Mr John James						
PO8193	Ms Janet						
	Lawton						
PO6417	Mr and Mrs P						
PO6476	Whitehurst						
PO6931	Mr P Squires						
PO6705	Mr K Rowland						
PO6250	Mrs J Brennan						
	Mrs D Cook						
PO6403	Mrs S						
PO6228	Goodwin						
PO6332	Mr B Wilson						
PO6496	Mrs P Newton						
	Ms S Wilson						
PO6365	Mr Gilbert						
	Bradley						
PO6303	Mr V A						
	Bainbridge						
PO6643	Mr J						
	Robertson						
PO7545	Mr Ronald						
	Bailey						
PO7299	Mr & Mrs R &						
PO7236	A Higgs						
	Mrs C Dale						
PO7194	Mrs L						
PO6573	Goodwin						
	Mr A Nixon						
PO6554	Mr Jeffrey						
	Leese						
PO6682	Mrs Ann						
PO6204	James						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD087 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO6092 PO6107 PO5590 PO5570 PO4902 PO7085 PO6596 PO5457 PO5846	Mrs J M Slater Mrs Alison Wickstead Mr I Frisby Mr D Cantrill Mrs S Wilshaw Mr R Wilshaw Mr B Barcoft Mr C Kisicki Mrs Beverley Holding Ms Diane Copeland Mr Carl Mason						
PO5605 PO6183 PO5803 PO5783 PO6072 PO6616 PO7399 PO7340 PO8137 PO9664 PO9686 PO10068 PO10167 PO9869	Mr Lewis Williams Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr Stephen Clowes Mr E Pearl Mr R Blood Mr and Mrs W Summerscales Mr and Mrs D P Pass Ms Emma Eardley Ms Barbara Griffiths Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs P Hancock G B Ford Mr N Clowes Mr Gayle				Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO2590	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO6175 PO5666 PO6545 PO5614 PO6787 PO5716 PO7288 PO7186 PO6802 PO6696	Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr K Davies Mrs Ann James Mr A Barbeard Mrs A Jones Mrs D Whalley Mrs C Dale Mr A Nixon Mr M Owen Mrs D Cook				Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO8380 PO8094 PO8053 PO8014 PO8031 PO7988 PO7167 PO7837 PO7857	Mr John James Mr K Davies Mr B Hyde Mr N Goode Mr K Parry Mrs A Brown Mrs G Hall Miss L Siddorn Mr H Whalley				Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO7354 PO7139 PO8635 PO8614 PO8785	Mr E Hilditch Mr A Atkinson Mr R Booth Mrs M Booth Mr J Whitehurst				Object	i object	Comment noted.
PO8969 PO8350 PO8556 PO8889 PO7755 PO8404	Mrs P Hindmarsh Mr N Mosson Mr R Scales Mr M Clews Mr R Bradbury Mr G Price				Object	i object	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO763	Mr Paul Malkin				Support	It makes sense to use this land for development if extra homes are required, with easy access to the a527 and the town centre and will also not negatively impact current residents	Comments noted.
PO7580	Mr Peter Turner				Support	These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements.	Comments noted.
PO9234	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	(Summary) Support the proposed allocation of land at and adjoining Jacksons Nurseries - Preferred Housing Allocation reference BD108 - along with the adjoining site references BD106, BD156 and BD055, for housing development. Reasons are: Land is previously developed and located within the Biddulph Town Boundary; Land is in a sustainable location within walking distance of the town centre and local bus services whole of Biddulph is within cycling distance; A range of local facilities are within 2km of the site - primary schools, secondary schools, supermarkets, convenience store, GP surgery; Pre-application discussions for this site and a neighbouring site have resulted in positive feedback including site layout (attached); Site has a willing landowner and developer and is technically deliverable; and Agree with results of options site assessment document published by the Council during the previous (Site Options Consultation) in regard to Site BD108.	Comments noted.
PO10051	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	Support development here, it would balance out the town and access from these sites is easily achievable. They are within walking distance of the town centre.	Comments noted.
PO9832	Mrs Margaret Biddle					Support development of this site. Residents are more likely to use the facilities of the town if they live within walking distance and commuters to the Potteries will be able to access their places of work without travelling through the town centre.	Comments noted.
PO4607 PO5065 PO10106 PO10038 PO10028 PO10146	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Ms Philippa Swindells Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mrs E Platt Mrs B Rowland				Support	Support.	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9872	Mr Gayle						
PO10159	Mr N Clowes						
PO10010	Mrs C Cliffe						
PO9985	Mr D Cliffe						
PO10198	Mrs I Tranter						
PO10170	Mr Robert Chambers						
PO10080	Mrs Claire Meadowcroft						
PO10095	Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding						
PO10061	G B Ford						
PO10184	Rev Lindsay Clowes						
PO10118	Mr R Meadowcroft						
PO9801	Mr Eric Biddle						
PO10133	Mrs Anne Young						
PO9991	Mr Ray Lloyd						
PO9655	Mr and Mrs A D Lawton						
PO9689	Mrs P Hancock						
PO7870	Mrs J Banister						
PO8113	Mr A Forrester						
PO7955	Mr A Lehepoo						
PO8078	Mrs V Jackson						
PO8957	Mr C Goodwin						
PO8237	Mr P kelly						
PO7713	Mr D Bradbury						
PO7733	Mrs E Griffiths						
PO7782	Mr R Hindmarsh						
PO7694	Mr J Shelly						
PO8330	Mrs S Bennett						
PO8289	Mr R Cook						
PO8536	Mr D Neal						
PO8575	Mrs J Siales						
PO8870	Mrs J.A. Bennett						
PO8686	Mrs Joan Draisey						
PO8594	Mrs R Knapper						
PO8665	Mr A Malbon						
PO8706	Mr R Willott						
PO8223	Mrs P Kelly						
PO8932	Mr and Mrs G						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7260	Bowyer						
PO7563	Mr A Weston						
PO7445	Mrs G Weston						
PO8730	Mr K Flannagan						
	mr Stephen Willott						
PO8750	Mrs Maureen Whitehurst						
PO8842	Mr Mark Cumberbatch						
PO8823	Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch						
PO8184	Mr and Mrs P Whitehurst						
PO8309	Mr A Hague						
PO8165	Mrs Angela Turner						
PO7973	Mrs C Hensor						
PO7893	Mrs S Sharrock						
PO8204	Mr D Smith						
PO7120	Mrs A Cunliffe						
PO7498	Mrs L Carter						
PO8492	Miss L Delves						
PO8149	Ms Janet Lawton						
PO8129	Ms Barbara Griffiths						
PO8425	R Hutton						
PO7935	Mr C Kirkham						
PO8473	Mr B.W. Newton						
PO8453	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						
PO6468	Mr K Rowland						
PO6242	Mrs S Goodwin						
PO6395	Mr B Wilson						
PO6220	Mrs P Newton						
PO6324	Ms S Wilson						
PO6522	Mr S Wilshaw						
PO8270	Mr Matthew Gratton						
PO8511	Mrs Gillian Flannagan						
PO6635	Mr Ronald Bailey						
PO6608	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO7388	Mr and Mrs D P Pass						
PO7331	Ms Emma Eardley						
PO7535	Mr & Mrs R & A Higgs						
PO7228	Mrs L Goodwin						
PO6408	Mr P Squires						
PO5754	Mr J Hammond						
PO5963	Mr M Clews						
PO5369	Mr S Leese						
PO5929	Mrs J Smith						
PO6508	Mr K Wilshaw						
PO6286	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe						
PO6900	Mr M Mason						
PO6881	Mr G Mason						
PO6863	Mr A Copeland						
PO6848	Mrs I Latta						
PO6082	Mr I Frisby						
PO6064	Mr R Blood						
PO6099	Mr D Cantrill						
PO6136	Mrs J Collier						
PO6155	Mr K Collier						
PO6029	Mr T Barker						
PO6981	Mrs M Elmhurst						
PO6956	Mr K Allen						
PO7013	Mrs D Stuttard						
PO6376	Mrs K Chaddock						
PO6993	Mr R Lawton						
PO5521	Mr N Moxon						
PO5498	Mr M Cook						
PO5481	Mrs L Cook						
PO6674	Mrs J M Slater						
PO6194	Mrs Alison Wickstead						
PO7043	Mr and Mrs B Carter						
PO6429	Mr Paul Malkin						
PO6823	Mr D Wickstead						
PO5390	Mrs S Harper						
PO5405	Mr G Harper						
PO5432	Mrs K Hallam						
PO5581	Mrs S Wilshaw						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD108 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO5559 PO4910 PO7065 PO6588 PO6654 PO6450 PO6565 PO5816 PO5638 PO5693 PO5795 PO6014 PO6002 PO5009 PO5540 PO5775 PO5596 PO5838 PO5739	Mr R Wilshaw Mr B Barcoft Mr C Kisicki Mrs Beverley Holding Ms Heather Mason Mr Norman Smith Mr Jeffrey Leese Mr Christopher Slater M Mitchell Mr Jason Eardley Mr Stephen Clowes Mr P Price Mrs L Price Mr R Milner Mrs M Moffatt Mr E Pearl Mr Lewis Williams Mr Carl Mason Mrs Eileen Smith						

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD117 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO2591	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Biddulph. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
PO1194	Mr P And Mrs J Dowson				Object	This idea of changing green belt area mixed use ie prefab low employment warehouses and the like is flawed. As well as providing a lovely gap between Biddulph and Stoke built up areas it provides excellent views over the glorious countryside. There are unoccupied units nearby already the Victoria Colliery site and the old steel works areas. There is no need for anymore in this area.	- An assessment of employment land requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land was required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. It was recommended and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) was taken forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan. An employment land requirement of approximately 27ha was therefore recommended up to the year 2031 for the Preferred Options Local Plan on the basis that it was at the top of the OAN range for employment and so closely corresponds with the proposed housing requirement to support sustainable development. Applying the 20% requirement for Biddulph wards in Pol SS3 Core Strategy gives a requirement for the town of at least 5.4ha, less qualifying 2014-17 employment commitments. A range of employment site choices have been selected for Biddulph – either close to the town centre or to the existing Victoria Business Park. This site has been selected primarily for employment use as it has good road links and is well related to Victoria Business Park so is likely to be attractive to businesses to help meet the employment needs of the District. - The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review (published in 2015) to assess all the Green Belt in the Staffordshire Moorlands and determine whether it may be suitable for removal from the Green Belt to meet the District's future development needs to 2031. For this site, it was concluded that the overall impact of development on the Green Belt would be limited. 'This site would infill land between Mill Hayes Road and the A527 Tunstall Road. As such, the land is reasonably well bounded, although smaller boundaries to the east and north are hedgerows. (See also land to the north of Mill Hayes Road). Recommendation – Consider for release – Release under exceptional circumstances,

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD117 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
							should be accompanied by extension of the Town Boundary.' - The Council has also undertaken a Landscape Impact Assessment of the site and this concludes that part of the site (adjacent to Tunstall Road) is of low landscape sensitivity but most of the site (south and east of Victoria Row) is of high landscape sensitivity and landscape mitigation measures are recommended if this area were to be developed. - The Council must balance all planning issues in determining the suitability of a site for inclusion in the Local Plan.
PO4988	Mr C Kisicki				Object	In relation to BD117 (housing/employment) on Mill Hayes Farm. The employment part should be ideally sited on the vacant land between Childerplay Road. There are already industrial units along part of the road, and it would make more sense to build new units further down this road than on Mill Hayes Farm.	Childerplay Road is within the Green Belt like BD117. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of this area for development would have. The Childerplay Road area is not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt. Area BD117 is considered suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO6266	Mr N Lunt				Object	This site is currently considered as a Green Belt. The land here is subject to flooding and access roads are completely unsuitable. This Green Belt site should surely be considered too far from the town centre and encroaching on Stoke-on-Trent.	- See response to PO1194 in relation to Green Belt Review. - The Environment Agency commented on the site at the Site Options Consultation Stage in 2015 and said "Site not identified as being in an area likely to be affected by flooding." - The Highway Authority has agreed that access from Tunstall Road opposite the Tunstall Road / Brown Lees Road junction would be acceptable.
PO8075 PO8317 PO8022 PO7205 PO7864 PO8830 PO6019 PO5017 PO5546 PO7082 PO7000 PO10017 PO6810 PO6331 PO8383	Mrs V Jackson Mr A Hague Mr N Goode Mr M Seddon Mr H Whalley Mrs Ann-Marie Cumberbatch Mr P Price Mr R Milner Mrs M Moffatt Mr C Kisicki Mr R Lawton Mrs C Cliffe Mr M Owen Ms S Wilson Mr John James				Object	i object	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD117 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO9964	Mr C Lunt				Object	Building here would encroach too closely to Stoke-on-Trent, again Biddulph identifies itself separately from S-o-T, that's what attracts people here and why it's such a nice place to live.	See response to PO1194 in relation to Green Belt Review.
PO1046	Mr G Cooper				Support	Could this not accommodate a few more houses than the proposed 65 because there is about 6.5 hectares of land & only 2 is required for employment purposes.	The site in total is 6.74ha. 4.74ha is proposed for employment to meet Biddulph's needs and the remaining 2 hectares is proposed for residential – giving a total of 80 houses (based on a density of 40 dwellings per hectare).
PO771	Mr Paul Malkin				Support	It makes sense to use this land for development if extra homes are required, with easy access to the a527 and will also not negatively impact current residents. Could this whole site not be used for housing to protect the areas that will majorly impact on current residents lives?	An assessment of employment land requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land was required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. It was recommended and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) was taken forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan. An employment land requirement of approximately 27ha was therefore recommended up to the year 2031 for the Preferred Options Local Plan on the basis that it was at the top of the OAN range for employment and so closely corresponds with the proposed housing requirement to support sustainable development. Applying the 20% requirement for Biddulph wards in Pol SS3 Core Strategy gives a requirement for the town of at least 5.4ha, less qualifying 2014-17 employment commitments. A range of employment site choices have been selected for Biddulph – either close to the town centre or to the existing Victoria Business Park.
PO4878 PO7701 PO7586 PO7127 PO7363 PO7268 PO7146 PO7455 PO8623 PO7741 PO4903 PO7020 PO6227 PO6525 PO8366	Mr Allan Knapper Mr J Shelly Mr Peter Turner Mrs A Cunliffe Mr E Hilditch Mr A Weston Mr A Atkinson Mr K Flannagan Mrs M Booth Mrs E Griffiths Mr B Barcoft Mrs D Stuttard Mrs P Newton Mr S Wilshaw Mr and Mrs W Summerscales				Support	I support	Comment noted.

Question 19 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocation BD117 in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General	Consultee / Agent Comments	Officer Response
PO10032 PO10125 PO10112 PO10043 PO8894 PO9663 PO9681 PO10138 PO10007 PO10177 PO5058 PO6182 PO5045 PO10154	Mrs E Platt Mr R Meadowcroft Mrs V Whiston Mr D Platt Mr M Clews Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs P Hancock mrs ANNE YOUNG Mr Ray Lloyd Mr Robert Chambers Ms Philippa Swindells Mr and Mrs D Barclay Mr G Boulton Mrs B Rowland				Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO9863 PO10086 PO10100 PO10067 PO10191 PO10166 PO9998 PO10201 PO10124	Mr Gayle Mrs Claire Meadowcroft Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding G B Ford Rev Lindsay Clowes Mr N Clowes Mr D Cliffe Mrs I Tranter Mr R Meadowcroft				Support	Support	Comment noted.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO34	Mr E Shaw				ADD03	Object	The roads leading in to Station Road, Halls Road, Mow Lane etc cannot cope with a further amount of vehicles. A further 744 vehicles (assuming each proposed property has two vehicles) plus school traffic using the access roads of Station Road etc would not cope with the vast increase of traffic. Akemore Lane does not have any other access other than from Wedgwood Lane which leads from the narrow Mow Lane. Akemore Lane is a road leading to various farms which have a regular daily use of large tractors and HGV's for deliveries etc accessing the farms and therefore further cars etc using the local lanes themselves pose a danger for the new proposed residents. The residents of the any new proposed development may well work in the City of Stoke on Trent or need to access the A500 and M6 therefore they would travel South along Akemore Lane, Towerhill Road etc and on through various nearby villages such as Newchapel, Harshead and therefore putting further pressure on very narrow busy side roads.	The Highway Authority has no difficulties with the principle of development in this location. Improvements needed to the road network as a result of development would need to be identified through a Transport Assessment. Also refer to PO2899 below.
PO41	Mrs Emma Hallen				ADD03	Object	The school would be built of greenbelt land which should remain protected from development. Access for parents and carers onto and out of Akemoor Lane and Mow Lane would be a problem. The extra volume of traffic onto akemoor lane would be a problem and potential danger.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site ADD03 for release from the Green Belt. - See response to PO34 regarding highways.
PO85	Mr Robert Moseley				ADD03	Object	Its on Green belt.	See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt.
PO307 PO544	Mr Russell Picken Mrs C Picken				ADD03	Support	The new school should be located in (ADD03 or within BD140 (to the immediate south of ADD03)). This is an ideal site as it is fairly central to the town. It would also be the only school on the west side of the town and could service Hayden Park, parts of Gillow Heath and some of the new builds on sites BD071 and BD071a, etc. This could have the effect of reducing traffic crossing the main roads through Biddulph and could reduce traffic congestion around Oxhey, Kingsfield and Knypersley First Schools. Currently the traffic congestion, caused by parents parking around Oxhey First School, at the start and the end of the day, virtually renders Pennine Way impassable. The school should be located close to the BVW, which could then be used to provide traffic free walking access to and from many properties in the area.	Comments noted.
PO156 PO164	Mrs Beverley Webb Mr Barrington Webb				ADD03	Object	ADD03 – Object to the building of new primary school on greenbelt when there is sufficient capacity to extend Oxhey School in Oxhey Drive as highlighted in the letter from Staffordshire County Council Education Department dated 14/9/2015.	- See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt. - Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet).
PO245	Mr Robert Stockley				ADD03	Object	ADD03 location for a school will create accident blackspots from the increased traffic on Wedgewood Lane, Halls Road and Akesmoor Lane, not to mention the other end of Akesmoor Lane at the junction with Tower Hill Road. There will be increased parking on all the afore mentioned roads plus Linden Drive and Smokies way. With all this increased traffic at peak times there are bound to be more accidents. The increased traffic along Akesmoor Lane towards Tower Hill Road junction will also cause accidents because of the lanes narrow nature, and its twists and turns, and the Tower Hill Road junction has blind approaches, so there will inevitably be accidents, some serious and potentially fatal. The Victoria Colliery site also encroaches into the green belt I believe, but this location has already been identified for development, and the residents of Brown Lees are expecting it, so why not build there, and join up with Newcastle BC to build a joint site. A school site on the Victoria Colliery location will create a safe access and egress for children, parents and residents so this site must be included as a potential. ADD04 + Victoria Colliery school sites will alter the catchment and provide shorter journey's for kids living a the west end of Biddulph.	- See response to PO34 regarding highways. - Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. - Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like ADD03. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO291	Mr David Spruce				ADD03	Support	Good location close to domestic areas reducing need for transport. On same side of bypass as new housing development, so no need to cross busy road.	Comments noted.
PO347	Miss Gemma Docksey				ADD03	Object	I understand that with the growing population and increased demand for us to provide more homes that this will increase the capacity our schools will need to be able to facilitate. I don't think that building more schools is the answer. Shouldn't we instead support the schools in Biddulph we already have? Looking at the plans for the potential allocation sites it would seem you want to build most new homes towards the Congleton end of Biddulph (I have stated my concerns about this in other question). It would then make sense to extend Ox Hey First school, there is a lot of land around the school! We could then spend the money we would spend on building a new school on employing more teachers and improve the learning opportunities for our future generation. I really don't believe that building a new school is the answer.	See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO1097	Mrs F Moore				ADD03		Object	Comment noted.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO537 PO600	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey				ADD03	Support	Developments on ADD03 are able to accommodate the proposed new Primary School and is close enough for access by foot, so against the School being located to the south: Eliminates the need to travel by car. Could design for safe parent drop-off / pick-up. Reduces by-pass volumes. Eliminates needing to cross the by-pass so safer for those on foot and reduces slowing of traffic. Therefore, greatly improving safety for our vulnerable young children. The area being best located to maximise the positive impact of all the above in support of Town Centre regeneration and Town Council income generation into the future and beyond. The above demonstrating why this is the best Sustainable Location in achieving the goals of the Staffordshire Moorlands Sustainability Vision.	Comments noted.
PO497	Mr Denver Johnson				ADD03	Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily, over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices. The infrastructure of our little end of Biddulph has always been strained by the population level, to suggest that the number of houses could be doubled is ludicrous. The main drawbacks to our location have always been increasing traffic on the A527 (it's too crowded now), flooding (gardens in the best drained locations tend to get boggy in Winter - the weather is getting wetter and some local actions like selling off the Grange and allowing the marsh drying Rhododendrons to be mass destroyed didn't help) and when the wind is in the wrong direction, the smell from the close sewage works. The placing of large developments even closer to the sewage works seems more like a criminal act than a thoughtless oversight. The Abbeystead, Lancashire waterworks disaster of May 1984 where a methane gas explosion severely wounded forty four people and killed eight outright including a mother and child should never be allowed to be forgotten. The cause of ignition has never been determined, however the good sense of at the very least leaving as many fields as possible around them was once enforced by law. Private takeover of Public utilities seems to have greyed this issue. From an explosives perspective (I'm a Physical Science Graduate) placing houses closer to such an installation is akin to packing a bomb with shrapnel and strapping innocent victims to it! Won't allowing these developments be exponentially raising the risks of the site being used as a terrorist soft target? How many other locations are there	- See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt - Property values are not considered material in planning law. - See response to PO34 regarding highways. - Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: "There is one Grade II Listed Building within the site. The setting of the asset contributes to the overall significance of it and would need special regard for its preservation. Development would be highly likely to cause adverse effects to its setting. Therefore, any development should be restricted to the southern part of the site only and mitigation should include the use of vegetation screening to reduce adverse effects to its setting. Whilst the HEA states that zone BBHECZ 18 cannot absorb significant change, development to the south of the site would be a small change to the zone as a whole, and with appropriate development, this could be accommodated on the site (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site is suitable for development in heritage terms, subject to suitable masterplanning; if development is restricted to the southern part of the site only and with appropriate screening." The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. - The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Nationally like this one, with the added blast focus of the steep valley sides? New houses on the proposed sites would not just be putting lives of new residents at risk. Wildlife - Biddulph attracts some rarities like buzzards and herons, sustains a large population of wild rabbits along with frogs, toads, snakes, foxes, stoats, badgers and hedgehogs. Pheasants, crows jackdaws, jays, magpies, woodpeckers (green and spotted) along with a large variety of the smaller birds. All of these animals would be hit by the loss of the green spaces and the draining of marshland. Heritage - Biddulph originated in the lee of the old 13th century Norman fort/castle built in Bailys Wood. All of the Mediaeval village would have been centred on the brook. The road from the South along the brook would have been important, but the fair road that no longer exists, running East West through the village would probably have been more important to the community and the North road out towards Congleton may not have been there since the fort was put there to control the area boundary. Bradley Green was the name of the village now using the name Biddulph. See 1806 map: http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/maps/series?xCenter=3216685.06303&yCenter=2985192.16842&scale=633600&viewScale=181417.4208&mapLayer=nineteenth&subLayer=smith_1806&title=C.%20Smith%20New%20Map%20of%20Great%20Britain%20and%20Ireland&download=true Biddulph Castle - Biddulph Lea Forge http://www.gatehouse-gazetteer.info/English%20sites/3308.html Archaeology - ancient Biddulph is still buried below the fields (inc. BD087) between Marsh Green Road and Bailys Wood. Bakers South field (BD068), from hearsay, was called 'the old garrison' - it's sited ~1000M South West of the old Biddulph Hall and would have been a very probable place for a Parliamentary cannon battery during the Civil war. I've found shards of what appear to be iron age or older pottery in this field close to the brook. I've got this depiction from a mix of reading and hearsay, but am currently in contact with 'The Biddulph Museum'. See: http://biddulphmuseum.com/index.html Flooding - Marsh Green gets its name from a long history of flooding. The glacial alluvial valley floor is an area for subsidence even without the help of the many mines close to the area and the existence of a large underground reservoir at our end of the valley that is the reason for there being less pit shafts this end. Access - Marsh Green road is a single track, dangerous to the many pedestrians that have to cross it daily on their way to the old railway line (Biddulph Valley Way - Route 55) and cars that face meeting on the sharp blind bend next to Suttons old farm. Marsh Green Road was at its safest when it was blocked off at the sewage works entrance to facilitate work on the bridge over the brook. ADD03 - has had a history of severe flooding. The field is boggy during the Winter and Spring with signs of subsidence. The entire site has been extensively mined and has	development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							probably been worked both on the surface and in deep pits going as far back as the Bronze age: in search of copper, iron and latterly coal. Access to this site is so bad that major infrastructure changes would have to be made to the area before it could be opened up.	
PO725	Mr Philip Beech				ADD03	Support	The inclusion of a new school within ADD03 can't come quickly enough. I believe that there are huge issues with school allocation in Biddulph, where children have to travel to a school which isn't the closest geographically. This is wholly unacceptable, and the inclusion of a new school may go some way to addressing this unfortunate issue. I believe that ADD03 should go ahead and wholly support it.	Comments noted.
PO691	Mr Ian Turner				ADD03	Object	The roads in the area are not capable of safely accommodating additional pedestrian and vehicle access.	See response to PO34 regarding highways.
PO773	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				ADD03	Object	The location would be really poor and somewhat dangerous for a school, ie winding, country lanes are not the best to walk along, especially on a dark winters night or morning. Biddulph does not need another school if they do not build more houses. If needed either extend existing ones or build on the former Meadows school site – James Bateman school still use the playing field there.	- See response to PO34 regarding highways. - See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO452	Mrs Kirsty Murphy				ADD03	Object	My views expressed regarding the amendment to the green belt apply to my reason for the objection to a new school. The issue with the volume of traffic outside all the current schools in Biddulph is an issue for drop off and in particular pick up. The site does not have any adequate access for the volume or traffic a new school would attract. With Haydon Park being easy access to the new site from the tracks I can clearly see cars trying to park up various roads on this estate for access and these roads are not wide enough for cars to be parked on either side. There are already many parked cars on the roads from the residents. The old school which has been demolished at the top of the bypass would have been a far better option with plenty of land to provide off road parking for pick up and drop off. There is much better access and far less disruption to the surrounding area.	- See response to PO34 regarding highways. - See response to PO245 regarding parking problems in relation to the possible new school.
PO578	Miss Louise Richardson				ADD03	Support	Knypersley end of Biddulph is the wrong place for a school. To add one to Akesmore Lane makes sense as at the moment Oxhey services such a large area and a growing population means that it's pushing people from my end of town (gillow heath) to town centre schools. This is a drivable distance only. This increases congestion and also discourages the 'healthy' activity of walking. Little legs can't go so far and for working parents there's no time to walk with schools potentially being so far away.	Comments noted.
PO751	Mr Paul Malkin				ADD03	Object	This is a ridiculous site for both housing and a new school, access will be via difficult to navigate country lanes and will put children's lives at risk on their journey to school.	See response to PO34 regarding highways.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO780	Mrs Jayne Beech				ADD03	Support	Biddulph North area has issues with school places for residents. I understand that Oxhey School does not have enough school places for residents living close by. A new school built in ADD03 would serve to improve on this. Traffic issues are worsening, so less travel during the school run time must be seen to be positive. I support the proposal to build a new school in ADD03	Comments noted.
PO951	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				ADD03	Support	Providing that a new access road can be constructed to the site directly from the town centre, the site is ideally suited. Should also consider expanding the existing primary schools within their existing footprints, where space provides.	Comments noted.
PO967	Mr Christopher Goldstraw				ADD03	Support	Providing that a new access road can be constructed to the site directly from the town centre, the site is ideally suited.	Comments noted.
PO1200	Mrs Y Pointon				ADD03	Support	Excellent idea to build new schools to accommodate new families.	Comments noted.
PO2565	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England			ADD03	General Comment	The new school is located near to existing playing field areas. It would be good of some co-location/shared use could be secured if this will improve sports provision for both the school and community (for example access to school changing rooms/toilets for users of the playing field or shared car park provision?)	Comments noted. The location of the school is dependent on where the bulk of new housing takes place in the town so once this is determined issues such as sharing facilities can be explored.
PO2854	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			ADD03	General Comment	In Biddulph it is noted that the Plan puts forward two potential locations for new First school provision. We will need to review both of these in detail in relation to transport matters and pupil movement to determine which of the two is to be taken forward in the Plan.	Comments noted.
PO2899	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			ADD03	General Comment	With regards to the two potential First School locations in Biddulph from an initial assessment we have the following comments to make from a transport planning perspective. There are currently no identified accident clusters in Biddulph and therefore it is unlikely that either site would be preferred based on the existing accident record. Site ADD03 would provide a greater geographic spread of first school provision in Biddulph and would be located some distance away from Biddulph High School which is likely to be a reasonable trip generator. If the whole site area shown in the consultation document is delivered following land assembly (300 homes) then there will be opportunities to provide car free access to the new school utilising National Cycle Network route 55 (NCN 55) for the new houses. Pedestrian connectivity for existing homes to the east of the site could also be enhanced by providing connections via NCN 55. If the site delivers 60 homes then the level of pedestrian connectivity would be dependent on the location of the school and land ownership.	Comments noted.
PO4857	Mr Chris Millington				ADD03	Object	Either site is surrounded by big developments and makes sense of a place schools within them. Do not want 'Primary Schools' as support 3 tier system but support a new first school.	Comments noted.
PO5196	Mr Peter Brittain				ADD03	Support	Western developments will help visibility + practicality.	Comments noted.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5141	Mr Gary Harding				ADD03	Support	Is able to accommodate the new primary school. It is also close enough to walk; it is close enough to the new medical centres and the pharmacies and shops	Comments noted.
PO5147	Ms Karen Harding				ADD03	Support	Building a development to the west of Biddulph would allow a school to be built in walking distance of the new development. The west is lower lying and can be naturally screened by trees etc.	Comments noted.
PO5150	Ms Karen Harding				ADD03	Support	The site of the new primary school would be in walking distance from a lot of this new development.	Comments noted.
PO5119	L C Millington				ADD03	Support	I think it's better to have a new school in ADD003 than stuck away from the town centre in ADD004. As long as adequate arrangements are made for pick up and drop offs, it could benefit the town centre as people pass by.	Comments noted.
PO5255	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				ADD03	Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options. The bypass itself is beneficial to the development on the west.	Comments noted.
PO5252	Mrs J Sutton				ADD03	Support	I fully support the council's proposals for the new school on the proposed development site no: ADD003 supported by residential housing. Developing a plan around the primary and secondary frontage strategy would make the town more attractive place to visit and conduct business.	Comments noted.
PO5133	Ms Lynne Evans				ADD03	Support	The old railway track has many more access routes that lend themselves to making developments here far easier, this area would avoid the problems experienced around the new uplands mill developments, with its squeezed together look and unattractive outcome, Again thank you for taking the Biddulph North Area a constrained site.	Comments noted.
PO4587	Mr & Mrs K Shone				ADD03	Object	Why are we building on Green Belt land? This amended Green Belt land should not be built until all the available Brown Belt land has been utilised. We object to building a school on ADD03 due the effects it would have on Haydon Park Estate and public walkway runs from Craigsides over Biddulph Brook to the top of Coopers Way over disused railway tracks which is now Biddulph Valley Green Belt walkway, on the land where the proposed school is to be built, which is also Green Belt Land. In our view this would create a huge disturbance to us and the people of Coopers Way as parents would be dropping their children off with vehicles and children would be walking the walkway up and down to and from school on Akemore Lane, if there had we would not have purchased our property. Why are we now proposed to plan to build a school on Green Belt land when there is already a school i.e.: The Meadows Special School which could have been extended to accommodate 100's of children, this would not have affected our local area in anyway and also had brilliant access off the A527 i.e. Biddulph bypass. This would in our view have released several existing school locations in Biddulph for potential building land.	- See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph would be appropriate for residential development. The larger ones (Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) are proposed as residential allocations in the plan. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs (refer to Town Council Masterplan). - See response to PO245 regarding parking problems in relation to the possible new school. - See response to PO34 regarding highways. - See response to PO156 regarding education.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5354	Mr D Heath				ADD03	Support	The west side of Biddulph would be close to the proposed care home in BD055 for relatives to visit, also Halls Road Sports Ground. It is also low lying so it is not so obtrusive.	Comments noted.
PO5287	Mrs S Purcell				ADD03	Support	I agree	Comments noted.
PO5307	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson				ADD03	Support	All these comments are sensible and constructive, and we agree with them completely.	Comments noted.
PO5275	Mr Carl Webb				ADD03	Object	Complete wrong locations and poor roads	See response to PO34 regarding highways.
PO5114	Mr Cottrell				ADD03	General Comments	If the 850 properties are built then new schools would be required could the Ox Hay School be extended.	See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO5154	Mrs P Alcock				ADD03	Support	The new primary school would be easily accessible from the new developments on the west of Biddulph.	Comments noted.
PO5164	Mr N McQuade				ADD03	Support	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comments noted.
PO5215	Mrs L McQuade				ADD03	Support	i support this	Comments noted.
PO5206	Miss F McQuade				ADD03	Support	I support this	Comments noted.
PO5226	Mr I Seabridge				ADD03	Support	i agree	Comments noted.
PO5244	Mrs P G Webb				ADD03	Support	New primary school is desperately needed/I strongly support the proposals here.	Comments noted.
PO5406	Mr G Harper				ADD03	Support		Comments noted.
PO5348	Mr I Barber				ADD03	Support	Building to the west would also appear to be the most sensible. It would be the most attractive for the town, and would be less intrusive. Closer to the town centre amenities and be the access from the by-pass and several other parts.	Comments noted.
PO5352	Mr I Barber				ADD03	Support	The area is suitable for the proposed new primary school; it will reduce the traffic flow, and mean that it will reduce the traffic flow, and that the children are safe, and do not have to cross roads, to get to school which is an added safety feature.	Comments noted.
PO5312	Mr A Picken				ADD03	Support	The new school should be located in ADD003 or BD140 south of ADD003. This is central to the town. This will and may reduce traffic around areas for our schools for example OX Hay, Kingsfield and Knypersley.	Comments noted.
PO5269	Mrs A Bridgette				ADD03	Support	Gives the opportunity to include dwellings for the elderly residents, close proximity to the health centre and the local amenities.	Comments noted.
PO10245	Mr R Hart				ADD03	Object	ADD03 strongly object as this is in the green belt and would cause traffic problems. I feel there is enough room to expand oxhey and woodhouse academy on these present sites.	- See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt. - See response to PO34 regarding highways. - See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO10054	Mr Philip Sutton				ADD03	Support	Support. This is a low lying area so development here would be less visually intrusive from Biddulph Moor or Mow Cop ridge	Comments noted.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							lines. Access to the town centre is quicker.	
PO9814	Mr Eric Biddle				ADD03	Support	This area would be suitable for a school.	Comments noted.
PO10023	Mr & Mrs D Cartwright				ADD03	Support	(Summary) Best location for parents and children to walk from new housing without having to use a car.	Comments noted.
PO10213	Mrs Julia Hackney				ADD03	Support	New schools will be needed for increased population and should be built to deal with increased traffic issues as traffic already plagues current schools.	Comments noted.
PO9977	Ms Ashley Kirkham				ADD03	Support	The housing of a new Primary School to the west of the bypass would be a perfect spot for adjacent housing developments and brilliant walking access to the town centre. Many pupils would be able to walk to school. It would link closely to the development of the town centre. It would constitute the best sustainable location in achieving the goals of the Staffs Moorlands sustainable vision.	Comments noted.
PO10238	Mr Robert Kirkham				ADD03	Support	The proposed west side sites would tie in wonderfully with the proposed new Primary School, also on the west. This would mean the possibility by foot and also mean the kids wouldn't have to cross the bypass. It would also constitute the best sustainable location in achieving the goals for the Staffordshire Moorlands sustainable vision.	Comments noted.
PO9875	Mr Gayle				ADD03	Support	Support	Comments noted.
PO184	Mrs Shirley Barlow				ADD03	Object	Object to Akeshire Lane too dangerous and out of the way as well and unsuitable land flooding and mineshafts and greenbelt	- See response to PO34 regarding highways. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed. - The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - See response to PO41 regarding loss of Green Belt.
PO73	mrs marilyn griffiths				ADD04	Object	This will cause additional vehicles using existing streets within the estate trying to find short cuts and parking places when dropping off and picking up children	See response to PO245 regarding parking problems in relation to the possible new school.
PO308	Mr Russell Picken				ADD04	Object	The proposed site of ADD04 is not suitable for a school, as it is at the southern extremity of the town, with very little proposed new housing development. Therefore this location would be unlikely to ease the current congestion around the existing schools and may actually increase the traffic on the main roads around Knypersley.	See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO326	FRANK COTTRELL				ADD04	Support		Comments noted.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO136	Mrs D Jacobs				ADD04	General Comment	It is presumed that extensive information has been gathered prior to site proposals. If however the proposed sites do not go ahead then the information would be invalid. This causes the public to feel that the proposals are already a done deal rather than a consultation. It will be good to see that council listens to and responds to concerns appropriately.	Comments noted.
PO142	Mr Carl Webb				ADD04	Object		Comments noted.
PO240	Mr Robert Stockley				ADD04	Object	I object to the ADD03 Akemoor Lane Site as a potential school location. The Akemoor Lane site would create accident blackspots with the convergence of the Wedgewood Lane/Halls Road junction. There would be increased traffic if a school was built on Akemoor Lane, and the resulting traffic increase would create hazards from parking on Wedgewood Lane, Halls Road, Acresmoor Lane, Linden Drive and Smokies Way. The increased school and housing traffic along Akemoor Lane from the Brown Lees area would create a second Accident Blackspot on the junction of Tower Hill Road, which is already a partially blind junction. Therefore I strongly urge that the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane sites are considered in preference, as the residents of Brown Lees already accept that these sites will be developed. The location of a school at the west end of Biddulph would also provide safe easy access to the school, and provide an alternative catchment for school children.	- See response to PO34 regarding highways. - See response to PO245 regarding use of Victoria Colliery / Childerplay.
PO271	Mr Christopher Hall				ADD04	Support		Comment noted.
PO289	Mr Peter Benn				ADD04	Object	No comments are visible. Why?	The comments made in response to the consultation have to be moderated before they can be published. They will all be published in due course at the same time.
PO545	Mrs C Picken				ADD04	Object	The proposed site of ADD04 is not suitable for a school, as it is at the southern extremity of the town, with very little proposed new housing development. Therefore this location would be unlikely to ease the current congestion around the existing schools and may actually increase the traffic on the main roads around Knypersley.	Comments noted. See response to PO156 regarding education.
PO608	Mrs Ellen Faulkner				ADD04	Object	Putting the school in a narrow country lane as not been thought through. What about the safety of pedestrians.	See response to PO34 regarding highways.
PO457	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				ADD04	Support	This area may be a good idea for a primary school as it will be within walking distance from many homes.	Comments noted.
PO439	Mrs Janice Deane				ADD04	Object	How will the children get to and from the school and what else will be provided in this area. Will it just be a housing estate with a school?	Comments noted.
PO472	Mrs Jean Wrench				ADD04	Support	Consideration for location to the west of Biddulph.	Comments noted.
PO633	Mrs Amanda Reed				ADD04	Object	Not a suitable site with inadequate access	See response to PO34 regarding highways.

Question 20 – Do you have any comments on the potential locations for a new school in Biddulph?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site	Support/Object/General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO655	Mrs Siobhan Perry				ADD04	Support		Comments noted.
PO858	Mrs Andrea Millington				ADD04	Support	I totally support a three tier system in Biddulph and if there is a new school would support a first school in a location that would take the strain off other over subscribed schools and near to larger developments where children are encouraged to walk to school.	Comments noted.
PO2564	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Sport England			ADD04	General Comments	The new school is located near to existing playing field areas. It would be good if some co-location/shared use could be secured if this will improve sports provision for both the school and community (for example access to school changing rooms/toilets for users of the playing field or shared car park provision?)	Comments noted. The location of the school is dependent on where the bulk of new housing takes place in the town so once this is determined issues such as sharing facilities can be explored.
PO2853	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			ADD04	General Comments	In Biddulph it is noted that the Plan puts forward two potential locations for new First school provision. We will need to review both of these in detail in relation to transport matters and pupil movement to determine which of the two is to be taken forward in the Plan.	Comments noted.
PO2897	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			ADD04	General Comments	With regards to the two potential First School locations in Biddulph from an initial assessment we have the following comments to make from a transport planning perspective. There are currently no identified accident clusters in Biddulph and therefore it is unlikely that either site would be preferred based on the existing accident record. Site ADD04 based on the published information is the largest housing site and is directly adjacent to BD069 which in combination will provide a total of 180 homes. Locating the new school on the largest housing site will provide the greatest opportunity for children to walk to school minimising the impact on the road network. Existing houses to the north of this site are in the catchment area of Knypersley First School which is located across the A527 from the houses. Locating a new school in site ADD04 would remove the requirement to cross the A527.	Comments noted.
PO9850	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				ADD04	Support	This area would support a school.	Comments noted.
PO9813	Mr Eric Biddle				ADD04	Support	This area would be suitable for a school.	Comments noted.
PO10022	Mr & Mrs D Cartwright				ADD04	Support	(Summary) Best location for parents and children to walk from new housing without having to use a car.	Comments noted.
PO10212	Mrs Julia Hackney				ADD04	Support	New schools will be needed for increased population and should be built to deal with increased traffic issues as traffic already plagues current schools.	Comments noted.
PO9969	Ms Claire Kirkham				ADD04	Support	A new primary school in the south would be ideal as it would be accessible, reduce car travel, bypass traffic, drop offs and improve safety for children.	Comments noted.
PO9874	Mr Gayle				ADD04	Support	Support	Comments noted.

Question 21 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph Town Centre Boundary?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO74	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				General comment	The boundary seems to be okay	Comments noted.
PO185	Mrs Shirley Barlow				General comment	We all know where the boundary is from Rio cafe to Garsides most shops are hairdressers no real shops as such.	Comments noted.
PO649	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Comments noted.
PO5195	Mr Peter Brittain				General comment	as per question 18	Comments noted.
PO5139	Mr Gary Harding				General comment	Biddulph bypass benefits Biddulph building on the west side.	Comments noted.
PO5146	Ms Karen Harding				General comment	If Biddulph needs to be developed it should be from the town centre out to the west. The bypass would also serve this area well	Comments noted.
PO5183	Mr J. Denton				General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comments noted.
PO5124	Ms Lynne Evans				General comment	The bypass enables the development of the town centre and the surrounding west side.	Comments noted.
PO5082	Mr J Neate				General comment	As stated above the level of homes in Biddulph area is at a saturated level. Moving west makes much more sense.	Comments noted.
PO5083	Mrs L Neate				General comment	As stated above the level of homes in Biddulph area is at a saturated level. Moving west makes much more sense.	Comments noted.
PO5176	Mr S Sneyd				General comment	Try to sort out the traffic from the town centre it must be very difficult to drive public transport (buses) in and around town centre. We need to encourage public transport in the area, and hopefully get our buses back on Thames Drive which are very much missed.	In recent years the road layouts have changed in Biddulph Town Centre and it would be up to the Highway Authority at the County Council if they consider any further changes are necessary. They have not advised the District Council as such. Again, public transport is a County Council matter and not within the scope of the Local Plan.
PO5165	Mr N McQuade				General comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comments noted.
PO5191	Mrs A Denton				General comment	The by-pass to the west of Biddulph town.	Comments noted.
PO10237	Mr Robert Kirkham				General comment	Make the town of Biddulph a pedestrian zone. This can be for the start of a town centre regeneration. This can be the first step in making the town centre more attractive to both Biddulph residents and from further afield. If we look at Congleton we see a lovely pedestrianised shoppable street which is attractive to travel to. Building on the west would allow a surge of pedestrian shoppers and provide a platform for the pedestrianised future of the town centre and high street.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO776	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				Object	The existing greenbelt boundaries need to be maintained.	Comments noted.

Question 21 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph Town Centre Boundary?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10055	Mr Philip Sutton				Object	Pedestrianisation of the town centre would make it safer from a traffic point of view and it would be visually more appealing. This would reduce the likelihood of residents travelling to Cheshire or the Potteries to do their shopping.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO4999 PO143	Mr R Milner Mr Carl Webb				Object	Object	Comments noted.
PO10239	Mr Robert Kirkham				Support	Building in the west just seems like a natural progression with accompanying nearby by-pass.	Comments noted.
PO10214	Mrs Julia Hackney				Support	Town centre needs to match other large town status facilities which it clearly doesn't.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town.
PO5243	Mrs P G Webb				Support	The town centre developments needed many more shops would be very welcomed.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town.
PO5295	Mr S Findlow				Support	I support	Comments noted.
PO5267	Mrs A Bridgette				Support	The bypass offers better development sites: It was designed that way. There would be better balances to the town. It is better to develop the town centre, making it more balanced Building here to the west is closer to the proposed site Chatterley Whitfield, gives the opportunity to the health centre and the town amenities.	Comments noted.
PO5223	Mr I Seabridge				Support	Essential to maintain character of the area with a definitive open area space – 'land boundary' Existing road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate road construction/specification not adequate to accommodate additional demand. Highways linkages and access road/egress poor. Any junction improvement at the Biddulph Road/Woodhouse Road priority junction will have an unfavourable impact on the character of the area.	Comments noted.
PO5238	Mrs P G Webb				Support	Many on the Uplands Mill development have not been sold.	Comments noted.
PO5092	Mr J Neate				Support	Development the Biddulph Town Centre will attract more shoppers to the town centre to spend money – must be good.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town.
PO5254	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options give the opportunity to achieve a better balance of the town.	Comments noted.
PO604	Mr Bill Hockey				Support	The Town Centre boundary could be sympathetically extended to facilitate the growth of shops (once those closed high street units are occupied), cafes, restaurants, etc., especially somewhere the teenagers want to go. The Town needs to encourage its residents and not discourage them.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. The retail industry in particular is very sensitive to change and the increases in people shopping online are affecting the amount of physical stores operators require.
PO5339	Mr D Heath				Support	The west side of the bypass lends to the better development to support the town.	Comments noted.

Question 21 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph Town Centre Boundary?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO458	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				Support	If we build out towards the west it should balance out the town	Comments noted.
PO859	Mrs Andrea Millington				Support	Filling out to the West gives the opportunity to achieve a better balance to the town.	Comments noted.
PO5233	Mrs I E Sefton				Support	Development and improvement of the Town Centre is essential. It is in danger of further deterioration unless specifics plans are generated. Accommodating a considerable increase in housing would make this of absolute necessity.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. The retail industry in particular is very sensitive to change and the increases in people shopping online are affecting the amount of physical stores operators require.
PO9876 PO9691 PO5335 PO5323 PO5331 PO7548 PO5216 PO5207 PO5172 PO5000 PO4887 PO5075 PO5280 PO5305 PO5327 PO5340 PO734 PO662 PO970 PO270 PO293	Mr Gayle Mrs P Hancock Mr G Morris Mr D Lovatt Mrs R Bellwood Mr Alistair McLoughlin Mrs L McQuade Miss F McQuade Mr S Sneyd Mr R Milner Mrs J Goodwin Mrs M Morris Mrs S Purcell Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson Mrs T. Cooper Mr D Heath Mr Philip Beech Mr Andrew Perry Mr Christopher Goldstraw Mr Christopher Hall Mr David Spruce				Support	Support	Comments noted.

Question 22 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph primary and secondary frontages?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO75	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				General comment	These again seem to be okay	Comment noted.
PO10021	Mr & Mrs D Cartwright				General Comment	(Summary) The High Street should be pedestrianised and would provide a site for a market Biddulph should attract national retailers which would support independents Need to attract people into the town to shop Bypass has meant that people bypass the town	Comments noted. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future. The retail industry in particular is very sensitive to change and the increases in people shopping online are affecting the amount of physical stores operators require.
PO5166	Mr N McQuade				General Comment	Thanks for listening to residents comments: Please keep as much Green Belt as possible very important.	Comment noted.
PO648	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Comment noted.
PO9975	Ms Ashley Kirkham				General comment	Make the town of Biddulph a pedestrian zone. Developing a plan around the Primary and Secondary frontages strategy will make Biddulph Town Centre much more attractive than it currently is.	Comments noted. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO1361	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			General comment	Map 4.6 - Biddulph Town Centre - Historic England has no objections in principle to the proposed primary and secondary frontages at this stage although it is difficult for these to be meaningful without any policy context at present. It is expected that such policy context would be addressed in the full Local Plan as it progresses and we may wish to comment further at that stage.	Comments noted. Policies relating to the primary and secondary frontages will be published in the next draft version of the Local Plan and comments will be invited.

Question 22 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph primary and secondary frontages?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1063	Mr Nicholas Tavernor				General comment	In the development of the town centre i would like to see a development scheme that will draw people into the town. maybe covered walk ways to shop fronts, improving shopper experience encouraging shopping in all weather. Biddulph can be seen in old photographs with victorian cast iron canopies to shop fronts, so it would be return to past form. A high street pedestrianised, on one level without kerbs and 'access only' for vehicles, this would improve the high street shopping experience and encourage shoppers.	Comments noted. There has been recent regeneration of the town centre. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO5194	Mr Peter Brittain				General comment	Increase the town pedestrianisation.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO5300	Mr S Findlow				General Comment	The elderly residents of the Pennine Way estate + the Washington Close area desperately need a round robin' mini bus service to help to get to the doctors and the shops and the dentist etc.: say from 9am – 3pm, it could be enterprising taxi service to set this up to help the elderly attend appointments. I strongly feel that the health infrastructure would be under great strain with such an increase in the population. I work at the local dental practice and we simply cannot cope with any more patients. We have to turn people away on a daily basis.	Comments noted. Your suggestions are outside the remit of the Local Plan. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals (including health infrastructure). It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO656 PO663	Mrs Siobhan Perry Mr Andrew Perry				Support	Making the town centre more attractive will encourage visitors.	Comments noted.
PO5356	Mr D Heath				Support	Building to the west side also closer to the Chatterley Whitfield site understood to create 2100 jobs. Being able to walk via the railway line.	Comments noted.
PO9971	Ms Claire Kirkham				Support	Developing a plan around the primary and secondary frontages would make the town centre more attractive.	Comments noted.

Question 22 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph primary and secondary frontages?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/Object/General Comments	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5308	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson				Support	All these comments are sensible and constructive, and we agree with them completely.	Comments noted.
PO5256	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options. The bypass itself is beneficial to the development on the west.	Comments noted.
PO5104 PO5105	Mr J Neate Mrs L Neate				Support	The recommendations regarding the Market Days/dedicated market area/link the Excellent.	Markets are outside the remit of the Local Plan. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO5350	Mr I Barber				Support	Regeneration of the town centre can only be achieved if the High street was made pedestrian zone, if the town was more attractive you can attract more visitors with Biddulph Grange Gardens to spend there.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO5217 PO5208 PO9877 PO5173 PO5289 PO5273 PO735 PO272	Mrs L McQuade Miss F McQuade Mr Gayle Mr S Sneyd Mrs S Purcell Mr Carl webb Mr Philip Beech Mr Christopher Hall				Support	i support this	Comments noted.
PO603 PO605	Mrs Pamela Hockey Mr Bill Hockey				Support	Improve the Town Centre layout. Why not have a pedestrian zone in the centre? Other Towns have shown how this encourages residents, and visitors from outside of the Town, to shop locally, and therefore pull other businesses in. Go for the successful 'Market Town' environment, ambiance and culture	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO5270	Mrs A Bridgette				Support	All the comments support Biddulph town centre.	Comments noted.
PO10056	Mr Philip Sutton				Support	Developing a plan around the primary and secondary frontage strategy would make the town an attractive place to visit and spend.	Comments noted.
PO9811	Mr Eric Biddle				Support	The primary and secondary frontage is needed.	Comments noted.
PO144	Mr Carl Webb				object	(No reasons given)	Comments noted.

Question 22 – Do you have any comments on the Biddulph primary and secondary frontages?

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? – (Comments on ADD03 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO462	Mrs Kirsty Murphy				ADD03	Object	I am very concerned by the way in which ADD03 was added at the last minute, as a resident I was not informed and only found out through a neighbour telling me, this is case for many other residents on Haydon Park. I can't understand how site options can be added without at least looking at the basic suitability, especially when its green belt. Access, drainage and previous mining surely should have been looked into first. It if had of been previous surveys of the land would have shown its unsuitability. This is the same for other sites proposed and in particular those around the sewage works. Please tell me who wants to spend money on a new house to be next to the sewage works!! Alternative sites have been highlighted to you by our local councillors which will have far less impact and provide good access and the ground is fair more suitable for building. As a town Biddulph would be far more accepting of proposals on these sites.	- The Local Plan production process, by its very nature, involves several stages of consultation at which point anyone can suggest further sites for inclusion in the plan and the Council decides on whether they are appropriate. This site was suggested as part of the site options consultation. - The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. - The Highway Authority has no difficulties with the principle of development in this location. Improvements needed to the road network as a result of development would need to be identified through a Transport Assessment. - The Council is aware of mining issues which affect a number of green field sites around Biddulph and investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - The site is not within floodplain and the Environment Agency has not commented as such. If there is an existing issue with surface water drainage then new development would need to address this. An on site SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) system would be required on this site if it were to be developed.
PO24	Mr Robert Moseley				ADD03	Object	ADD03 makes no sense and we are not in exceptional circumstances to build in the green belt here.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site ADD03 for release from the Green Belt. - If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? – (Comments on ADD03 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7216	Mr B Roberts				ADD03	Object	Object to the removal of plot BD110 and the inclusion of plot ADD03 Plan displayed in Biddulph Town Hall on 5th May 2016 had a new plot displayed; Akeshire Lane (ADD03) along with all the other original plots including those to the east (BD067a,b,c BD110 and BD134) The drop in session in the Town Hall on the 11th May had a new version of the plan which retained Akeshire Lane plot but had all of the plots to the east removed. Both of the above changes were unannounced and no formal or official explanation given. One of the councillors present at the drop in session when asked to explain the changes replied that 'planning were advised by the Greenbelt Committee (Greenbelt Review) that the preferred option was to use the greenbelt land to the west rather than that to the east even though the sites to the west had not been discussed in any previous meetings' This is not an adequate explanation. The new (current 20th May) plan clearly shows all the Akeshire Lane, plots to the north to be in greenbelt that has been designated as 'Amended' presumably to allow building and development. If this can be done for these plots then it can be done for those plots to the east, they are of a similar quality and use. The plots to the east which have been removed without any adequate explanation, we believe offer a much better option than the Akeshire Lane plot for the following reasons; The plots lie adjacent to an established housing estate that has good roads and services including footpaths and lighting. A service road is already in place, Plover Drive providing direct access to plot BD110. Similarly Firwood Road gives access to plot BD067a and Blackbird Way to plot BD134. The school, Oxhey Primary is situated adjacent to plot BD067a and could be extended into this plot to provide the extra primary school provision required. The loss of amenity in developing this land is no greater than that proposed for the development of other sites such as ADD03.	- See response to PO24 in relation to Green Belt Review and Exceptional Circumstances - See response to PO462 in relation to introduction of this site for potential housing development at this stage in the process.
PO767	Mrs Sharon Kirkham				ADD03	Object	(Summary) Unhappy with knowledge and attitude of planning officers who staffed the Biddulph consultation event. The ideal locations for development for housing and an extra school, would be Victoria colliery and Childerplay. These areas are ripe for regeneration and as previous brownfield sites have been cleaned up from the old mine workings, and are deemed suitable for housing. Why would anyone even think about building on greenbelt when these areas are available for development?	Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like ADD03. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? – (Comments on ADD03 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO579	Miss Louise Richardson				ADD03	Support	SITE ADD03 Akesmore Lane has the potential for 300 houses not just 60! This would create a small community that could incorporate a school, shops, amenities, etc. It would take up a large allocation and would make sense! You can build access directly from Wharf Road to the Bypass - just what the bypass is for - taking traffic away from the surrounding areas! Why has this not been explored??	Comments noted.
PO978	Mr Peter Turner				ADD03	Support	The Akesmore Lane site (ADD03) which could potentially offer up to 300 units will provide significant CIL contribution thereby efficiently using the allocation of housing development rather than multiple small sites.	Comments noted.
PO860	Mrs Andrea Millington				ADD03	Support	Extending to the West past the current Town Boundary into the area bounded by Akesmoor Lane, Brown Lees and the old rail track gives the opportunity to build organic housing developments instead of ribbon developments (lines of properties) making them more attractive, be in keeping with the rural nature that Biddulph Residents want to retain and enables the types of houses that potential buyers are looking for to be built. Only building on smaller and / or hemmed-in sites risks a repeat of what has happened on the Selectus site where houses have been built that no one wants to buy. Doing this across Biddulph may achieve the target numbers on the fewest sites possible but it would change the nature of the town in a very bad way and certainly not bring the desperately needed wealth into the town. Sympathetically developing this area to the West and using the less contentious parts provides the opportunity to achieve the required numbers with desirable properties and that will be close to the least number of existing dwellings and where there is space to include natural screening around the development and open spaces and natural screening within. ACCESS: There are already several existing routes across the old rail track, off / from Marsh Green Lane Mow Lane Station Road Wharf Road New Pool Road. With 'large' developments, the Developer has an obligation to financially contribute to infrastructure improvements via the Community Infrastructure Levy, previously known as Section 106. Build nature sensitive access routes: bridge, tunnel, etc. to the Town side, widen lower Akesmoor Road to the West, etc. NATURE: Widen the natural screening of the old rail track by including a band along to the west which: Separates this development from the developments BD016, BD055, BD071, BD071a, BD106, BD108 & BD156 between the rail line and the by-pass. Makes a wider nature corridor along there. Adds to the visual and public open space in Biddulph. ADVANTAGES: It is a low laying area so will be a less obtrusive development, especially with natural screening. Enables pedestrian access to the Town Centre reducing car use, demand for increased car parking and pollution from vehicles. Provides close proximity to the amenities, e.g. the Health Centre and the	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? – (Comments on ADD03 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							planned late night Pharmacy. Gives the opportunity to include dwellings for the older residents where they will have close proximity to the Town Centre amenities. Reduces the likelihood of residents travelling north to Congleton or south to Stoke for their shopping, Close to the proposed Care Home in BD055 for those with elderly relatives and friends. Closer to the Halls Road sports grounds than potential developments to the south east of the town, reducing traffic volumes. It is able to accommodate the proposed new Primary School and is close enough for access by foot, so against the School being located to the south: Eliminates the need to travel by car. Could design for safe parent drop-off / pick-up. Reduces by-pass volumes. Eliminates needing to cross the by-pass so safer for those on foot and reduces slowing of traffic. Therefore greatly improving safety for our vulnerable young children. The area being best located to maximise the positive impact of all the above in support of Town Centre regeneration and Town Council income generation into the future and beyond. The above demonstrating why this is the best Sustainable Location in achieving the goals of the Staffordshire Moorlands Sustainability Vision.	
PO956	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				ADD03	Support	Practical Deliverable Alternatives ADD03 (up to 300 dwellings) Supported by appropriate roadway infrastructure, a new road from Biddulph town centre. Under no circumstance should Akesmore Lane be used for site access. Significant development scale capacity to meet the CIL requirements to provide significant local benefit. Significant development scale capacity to contribute significant housing numbers to required Local Plan total. Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Biddulph Town Council support Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on ADD04 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4761	Mr and Mrs K & C Alcock				ADD04	Object	Impact on highway traffic and road safety 7. Site access would be via a narrow private road leading to a farm track. The entrance road may need to be widened making this site impossible or difficult to develop without complex land acquisition. 8. The area around Harlech Drive and Conway Road has three schools in the immediate vicinity already and is affected by high traffic flow at peak times. 180-280 new houses (ADD04 & BD069 combined) would cause an estimated increase in traffic flow of up to 550 extra cars causing significant extra traffic problems. 9. This site is not a suitable location for the proposed new school. Knypersley already has a pre-school nursery and a primary school nearby. Entrance to the site is via a quiet residential district mainly occupied by elderly people. Quality of life will be harmed and there could be significant disruption to the existing community. Effect on the landscape 10. Open countryside, public footpaths, historic parkland in the vicinity of Knypersley Hall (Grade II* listed), the fishing pool, the cricket pavilion, and fields adjacent to Knypersley Cricket Ground are all an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. (The cricket ground itself was donated to the community by Robert Heath). Open countryside forms an integral part of the surrounding natural landscape and, if developed upon, connection between the Knypersley community and the natural environment would be lost forever. 11. Development of this site would cause significant harm to Knypersley sense of place and to its unique semi-rural village identity centred upon Newpool Meadows, the cricket ground and pavilion, and its magnificent landscape setting. This new housing would significantly harm the local landscape and potentially could damage the separate “village community” identity that Knypersley enjoys at present. NPPF policy states that merging of neighbouring communities is to be prevented. 14. Further south lies an area of ancient valley farmland, the last remaining such farmland in the Biddulph Valley. The conservation of this area is also recognised as important and this farmland, together with its historic field boundaries, should be preserved for the long term future benefit of our town’s heritage. 15. Nearby Knypersley Fishing Pool is already designated as a protected nature conservation site. Existing hedgerows within the proposed ADD04 site boundary host a large array of wildlife that would perish as a result of this development. Bats are known to live nearby. Therefore this site, if developed for housing, could have a serious detrimental impact on nature conservation efforts in this locality.	From the Highway Authority’s point of view, a Transport Assessment would be required at the planning application stage. Creation of an access directly onto the A527 is preferred though a limited amount of development could be accommodated using an access onto Harlech Drive. No concerns were raised by the Highway Authority about any localised traffic problems as a result of development here. Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. Landscape impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council’s Landscape Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: ‘Site comprises land to the west and south of Knypersley Hall, including a large, open field which slopes down from the hall in the north of the site, and more undulating land in the south of the site containing a pond and scattered trees. The site is separated from the settlement edge by Knypersley Hall and agricultural land to the north. Development of the site could adversely affect the existing settlement form, particularly in the southern extent of the site. The northern section of the site has high visual prominence, particularly when viewed from Tunstall Road. Site is of high landscape sensitivity. Please note that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC’s Local Plan. Therefore, the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development. Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. This issue would be considered at the planning application stage.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on ADD04 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								Heritage Impact of development on the site has been assessed in the Council's Heritage Impact Study (August 2016), the results for this site are: 'There is one Grade II* and one Grade II Listed Building within close proximity to the site. The site contributes greatly to the setting of the Grade II* as a remnant of the parkland, which in turn, contributes to the overall significance of the asset. Development on the site would highly likely cause substantial adverse effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building which would impact upon its overall significance. The HEA states that development is not deemed appropriate in the HLC zone BBHECZ 7 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010). Site could not be developed without substantial heritage impacts'. It should be noted that this study forms part of a wider evidence base to support SMDC's Local Plan. Therefore, the Council will weigh this conclusion against other evidence when determining the overall suitability of the site for development. In the event of development in this area, sports facilities would be retained. In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study concludes that the overall impact of this area on Green Belt purposes is moderate. It states that: "This is a significant area of land which cannot be readily subdivided because of an absence of clear internal boundaries. It is well contained physically and visually by Mill Hayes Road and whilst making a contribution to Green Belt purposes in respect of separation and setting, comprehensive masterplanning (which would retain existing open space and sports pitches) could yield a development which would help to reinforce wider Green belt function. See also BD069, BD117, BD131b. It recommends considering site ADD04 for release from the Green Belt. If this site is selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. Ecus Ltd conducted Phase 1 ecological survey (incorporating Local Wildlife Site Assessment) in 2016. It concluded that the habitats on ADD04 were considered to be of nature conservation value at the site level only and are not listed as an important habitat in the

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on ADD04 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								Staffordshire SBI guidelines. Species recorded on site were common and widespread both at a county and national level and it is considered unlikely that the site significantly supported any notable protected species. [Some predevelopment species surveys recommended].
PO4841	Mrs Harper				ADD04	Object	Impact on highway traffic and road safety 7. Site access would be via a narrow private road leading to a farm track. The entrance road may need to be widened making this site impossible or difficult to develop without complex land acquisition. 8. The area around Harlech Drive and Conway Road has three schools in the immediate vicinity already and is affected by high traffic flow at peak times. 180-280 new houses (ADD04 & BD069 combined) would cause an estimated increase in traffic flow of up to 550 extra cars causing significant extra traffic problems. 9. This site is not a suitable location for the proposed new school. Knypersley already has a pre-school nursery and a primary school nearby. Entrance to the site is via a quiet residential district mainly occupied by elderly people. Quality of life will be harmed and there could be significant disruption to the existing community. Effect on the landscape 10. Open countryside, public footpaths, historic parkland in the vicinity of Knypersley Hall (Grade II* listed), the fishing pool, the cricket pavilion, and fields adjacent to Knypersley Cricket Ground are all an integral part of the landscape of Knypersley. (The cricket ground itself was donated to the community by Robert Heath). Open countryside forms an integral part of the surrounding natural landscape and, if developed upon, connection between the Knypersley community and the natural environment would be lost forever. 11. Development of this site would cause significant harm to Knypersley sense of place and to its unique semi-rural village identity centred upon Newpool Meadows, the cricket ground and pavilion, and its magnificent landscape setting. This new housing would significantly harm the local landscape and potentially could damage the separate “village community” identity that Knypersley enjoys at present. NPPF policy states that merging of neighbouring communities is to be prevented. 14. Further south lies an area of ancient valley farmland, the last remaining such farmland in the Biddulph Valley. The conservation of this area is also recognised as important and this farmland, together with its historic field boundaries, should be preserved for the long term future benefit of our town’s heritage. 15. Nearby Knypersley Fishing Pool is already designated as a protected nature conservation site. Existing hedgerows within the proposed ADD04 site boundary host a large array of wildlife that would perish as a result of this development. Bats are known to live nearby. Therefore this site, if developed for housing, could have a serious detrimental impact on nature conservation efforts in this locality.	Refer to response made to previous correspondent (above) who has raised the same issues.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on ADD04 housing site)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1044	Mr G Cooper				BD117 & ADD04	Support	The Southern area of Biddulph using BD117 & the previously larger ADD04 would seem to be best for the additional 2 hectares of employment land required & the a large quantity of the houses required which would have a far less impact on the town because I would say the majority of the traffic goes to Stoke so they would not have to travel through the town.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5827	Mr Carl Mason				BD062	Object	Sewage works currently over its designed capacity. Severe odour, noise and now raw sewage pollution already exists. Pollution to Biddulph Brook would be severe. Green Belt Land currently – not suitable for housing would as it's on a flood plain. Staffordshire Highways have already responded to our protest to say road infrastructure is not suitable and would be dangerous, more noise pollution. The natural habitat provides homes for the valued wildlife including badgers, foxes, bats and many more species of birds. This development would not enhance or add any value to the quality of life of the local community.	• United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. Noise and odour assessments have been undertaken which demonstrate that the site could be developed without adverse impact on future residents. • In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD062 for release from the Green Belt. • The site boundary has been amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2 at the request of the landowner, who does not own this land and is not promoting it for development. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site. • The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a Transport Assessment. • The Council's Phase 1 Habitat consultants consider the site habitats to be of nature conservation value at district level and have the potential to support bats and reptiles, which could allow the consideration of the site as an SBI or BAS. Further survey work would need to take place prior to any development to establish Site of Biological Importance (SBI) / Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS). Prior to any development an assessment would be required of the 2 trees for their potential to support roosting bats and a reptile survey. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application.
PO10246	Mr R Hart				BD062	Object	Feel that current infrastructure is already at a maximum and that the proposed housing allocation is far too much for Biddulph. Roads, doctors, schools all over stretched. Sewage works would need to be extended taking in BD062. So if BD062 developed, the sewage works would not be able to expand. Use infill sites and all brownfield sites.	• National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/G eneral	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								- See response to PO5827 in relation to highways. - See response to PO5827 in relation to water treatment works. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph would be appropriate for residential development. The larger ones (Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) are proposed as residential allocations in the plan. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites. - Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt like BD062. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO5940 PO5805 PO5784 PO6526 PO6728 PO6530 PO6528 PO6757 PO6738 PO6715 PO6497 PO6754 PO6294 PO6735 PO6477 PO6304 PO6622	Mrs Kathleen Boulton Mr Christopher Slater Mr Stephen Clowes Mrs Beverley Holding Mrs Gillian Flannagan Mr Jeffrey Leese Mr J Greatbatch Ms Barbara Griffiths Mrs E. Smart R Hutton Mr K Wilshaw Mr C Kirkham Mr and Mrs I Condliffe Mr and Mrs G Bowyer Mr Gilbert Bradley Mr J Robertson Mr Ronald				BD062 / BD068	Object	(Summary) - The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its' designed capacity population of 17,000 people (2011 Biddulph census 19,892). Local residents on Long Valley Road, Portland Drive, York Close, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as noise, odour and raw sewage flooding. - In periods of heavy rain, raw sewage floods the system, backfills and pollutes private properties (experienced by 34, 36 and 38 Essex Drive). The sewerage system cannot cope and the site experiences an overflow of raw sewerage from the man-hole covers which then runs directly into the Biddulph Brook (evidenced with sanitary products distributed around the sewerage treatment facility pipes at the end of Essex Drive). Building houses on this site even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts, leading to an increase in statutory nuisance incidents. It contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy SD Policy 4 where the Council states that it will refuse schemes which are pollution-sensitive adjacent to polluting developments. - The site is currently protected as Greenbelt, and only considered suitable for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances. Removing this site from the Greenbelt prioritises development in the floodplain which contradicts	- United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. United Utilities considers that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. - Current issues experienced by residents in regard to raw sewage flooding are a separate matter to be investigated by United Utilities. - Noise and odour assessments have been undertaken which demonstrate that the site could be developed without adverse impact on future residents. - In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD062 for release from the Green Belt (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. - The site boundary has been amended to exclude land within Flood Zone 2 at the request of the landowner, who does not own this land and is not promoting it for development. This approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency since their response to the consultation so a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment is no longer required for the site. - See response to PO5827 regarding ecology. - A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/G eneral	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6711	Bailey Mr and Mrs W						SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy SD 4 when a range of sites are available exceptional circumstances are not demonstrated. - The site is in Flood Zone 2. - The presence of a wet meadow (Phase 1 Habitat Survey) evidences the current high level of surface water runoff this site experiences. Development will increase surface runoff in close proximity to a watercourse, reducing lag time into the Biddulph Brook leading to increased flooding. The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “... the site is not recommended for potential development...” It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way). The SMDC Local Plan Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded “... the site is not recommended for potential development...” It is the ONLY site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other sites are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and species and has the potential to be a Species Rich Farmland site. It is very well connected to other biodiverse habitats (evidenced in the Phase 1 Habitat survey). In the absence of a SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy, the findings of this survey must be heeded. Development would contradict Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and Policy C3, NE1 and section 8.7.17 of the SMDC LDF Core Strategy. This site is important because of its mix of habitats, particular species found and its vital wildlife corridor linkages (where the Biddulph Brook meets the Biddulph Valley Way)1. The SMDC Green Infrastructure Strategy ,	Preferred Options consultation. - The Highway Authority has no difficulties with this development from their point of view. Cumulative impact of several developments in this area would be assessed through a Transport Assessment. - New housing development would make a contribution towards Biddulph’s housing needs.
PO6721	Summerscales Mr B.W. Newton							
PO6720	Mrs Carol Hill							
PO6722	Miss L Delves							
PO6534	Mrs Ann James							
PO6713	Mr John James							
PO6663	Mrs J M Slater							
PO6707	Mr A Hague							
PO6333	Mr J Hodgson							
PO6418	Mr Paul Malkin							
PO6366	Mrs K Chaddock							
PO6709	Mr N Mosson							
PO6708	Mrs S Bennett							
PO6706	Mr R Cook							
PO6685	Mrs D Cook							
PO6753	Mr R Scales							
PO6751	Mrs J Sailes							
PO6231	Mrs S Goodwin							
PO6741	Mr M Clews							
PO6772	Mr K Flannagan							
PO6714	Mr G Price							
PO6305	Mr A Gresham							
PO6718	Mr A Gresham							
PO6759	Mrs V Jackson							
PO6209	Mrs P Newton							
PO6739	Mr C Goodwin							
PO5951	Mr H Ebdon							
PO5979	Mrs J Ebdon							
PO5919	Mrs J Smith							
PO5896	Mrs B Bainbridge							
PO6511	Mr S Wilshaw							
PO6774	Mr J Banister							
PO6777	Mrs J Banister							
PO6758	Mr A							

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/G eneral	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5847	Forrester Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan						which was supposed to guide decision making about the environment and its linkages across the Local Plan area does not exist. In the absence of such strategic data, the Phase 1 Habitat Survey findings must be prioritised and used to guide decision making. “ 2. Its inclusion contradicts Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity 3. Its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy C3 Sustainable Communities where existing and potential sites of nature conservation value are linked, biodiversity is increased and the urban fringe is enhanced. - Neither the distributor road (Mow Lane) nor the feeder roads (Essex Drive and York Close) meet the minimum standards for the SCC highways Design Guide Policy. The roads are too narrow and the road has to pinch points over bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath. There is no scope for the required improvements. - This site will deliver too few homes to add any measurable contribution to the community infrastructure levy (CIL), it will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Gillow Heath. Its inclusion contradicts the SMDC LDF core strategy Biddulph Area Strategy where new housing allocation is prioritised on urban development’s help secure infrastructure improvements for benefit of the newly developed part of town. The current capacity of the United Utilities sewage treatment works is reported to be serving up to 17000 residents. The population of Biddulph as it 2011 census was 19892 residents. An increase of 885 houses approximately 3000 people will obviously require investment in its facility. This will not be facilitate by the inclusion of numerous small development site, but rather fewer larger sites which are able to utilize the CIL.	
PO5980	Mr P Price							
PO5994	Mrs L Price							
PO5764	Mr E Pearl							
PO5804	Mr K Rowland							
PO6778	Mr and Mrs C.B. Dodds							
PO6768	Mr Matthew Gratton							
PO6732	Mr and Mrs I Condliffe							
PO5826	Mr Carl Mason							
PO6767	Mr Mark Cumberbatch							
PO6765	Mrs J.A. Bennett							
PO6766	Mr and Mrs F T Rowley							
PO6770	Mr R Bradbury							
PO6763	Mr A Lehepoo							
PO6764	Mr C Kirkham							

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6527	Mrs Beverley Holding				BD062 / BD068	Object	It makes no sense at all to extend boundaries into Green Belts when there are adequate sites within the urban locations. Furthermore as outlined is typed text overleaf my concerns would be around flooding if building went ahead on the proposed sites BD068 and BD062 water (rain) runs from Mow Cop and lies at the foot of both these sites. Therefore building there even drainage will cause environmental issues. This working against the natural contours of the land.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site BD062 for release from the Green Belt. - See responses to PO10246 regarding use of mills and other brownfield sites. - See response to PO5940 regarding flooding.
PO6733	Mr and Mrs I Condcliffe				BD062 / BD068	Object	Public health – too close to the sewage works, there is already noise and smell. Flood risk – the brook floods and it is an issue. Green Belt – loss of the countryside, wildlife and open space. Highways issues – Marsh Green Road is too narrow and could not cope with more traffic, risk of a accidents. Objections 1- 4 use brown field land or land that has previously been developed.	- See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. - See response to PO5940 regarding flooding. - See response to PO6527 regarding Green Belt. - See response to PO5827 regarding loss of wildlife. - See response to PO5940 regarding Highways. - See responses to PO10246 regarding use of mills and other brownfield sites.
PO6254	Mr J Robertson				BD062 / BD068	Object	Attached are four specific objections. Objection no 3 is of particular importance this road Marsh Green Road is frequently used by myself and many others for cycling, walking, especially with dogs, horse riders extra traffic would be a serious danger at the junction of Marsh Green Road and Congleton Road (the main road). The extra traffic from the road would be a serious danger to every road user, given the narrowness of Marsh Green Road. I also specifically brought my property with the view of the hillside and not in the middle of a housing estate. There is Land available to the south of the town which doesn't have much use for other purposes this area would not have much of an impact on others if developed and there is room for infrastructure to be upgraded.	- See response to PO5940 regarding Highways. - Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. - See responses to PO10246 regarding use of mills and other brownfield sites. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/G eneral	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6710	Mr and Mrs W Summerscales				BD062 / BD068	Object	Marsh Green Road is potentially a dangerous road already. It is not safe to walk with a pushchair due to the very narrow and uneven roads particularly in the summer months when the hedges limit a single side of the carriageway. The junction with Congleton Road is also a problem not only because of the dip in the road towards the Church which makes it difficult to see cars coming from the Congleton Direction. This together with the junction of Woodhouse Lane directly opposite and the fact that many drivers speed along that road (hence the use of the speed vans on a regular basis) make it a hazard. There appear to be much more suitable sites that have a far better access and would not impact on the green belt. I understand that Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road have been suggested and I agree that they seem much more appropriate. The access is far better and there is a good bus service should it be required.	• See response to PO5940 regarding Highways. • See responses to PO10246 regarding use of mills and other brownfield sites.
PO6260	Mr and Mrs M. Flanagan				BD062 / BD068	Object	Objection 1 This site shares the Boundary with the sewage works which is already over its designed capacity of 17.000 people. Residents in Portland Drive, Essex Drive and Marsh Green Road already experience unacceptable amenity impacts of odour, raw sewage, pollutes Biddulph Brook. Building houses even closer to the sewage works will increase these unacceptable impacts. Objection 2 This site is protected as Green Belt and should not be released from the Green Belt. It is also a flood plain; it is also a hive of activity for the wildlife, not to mention, foxes, badgers, rabbits, stoats, bats and a wonderful variety of birds. Objection 3 Marsh Green Road does not meet the minimum standards for SCC Highways Design Guide Policy the road is too narrow with twists and bends, no footpath or lighting and access onto Congleton Road is very poor due to the busy traffic and poor visibility due to the dip in the road it is also an accident hotspot. Objection 4 The site is totally unacceptable, and will not bring any direct benefit to the community of Biddulph North its inclusion contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy where new housing is allocated on urban extension land. The massive improvements required to feeder and distributor roads do not seem possible due to the small scale nature of the development. I would like for you to consider alternative sites at the Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road which seem a lot more suitable.	• See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO6527 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO5940 regarding flooding. • See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • Site BD062 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6533	Mrs Ann James				BD062 / BD068	Object	As per summary of objections as listed with special objection given the risk of flooding, risk with close proximity to the sewage works, which has total number of residents. The safety requirements of the access to the development of the sites via the highways i.e.: roads access etc.: The area of outstanding beauty surrounding Biddulph should be undeveloped, and not to be used to house people from other areas coming into Biddulph.	• See response to PO5940 regarding flooding. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO5940 regarding highways.
PO6256	Mr John James				BD062 / BD068	Object	The comments made on the listed objections are relevant to the proposed development. The concern relating to access via Marsh Green Road as being unsuitable. The close proximity to the sewage works which has an overall capacity for 17,000 residents and should not be exceeded. The access of the proposed site is not adequate. The Green Belt area of Biddulph should be retained and the area of Biddulph is an outstanding beauty should be left undeveloped and not spoilt.	• See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO6527 regarding Green Belt.
PO6252	Mr B Wilson				BD062 / BD068	Object	I am strongly opposed to the proposed site, Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road sites appear to be a better development sites, my objections are: Loss of wildlife consisting of various species of Bats, owls foxes rabbits newts birds etc. The site if developed is close to the water treatment works which will increase raw sewage overflow and polluting the water course, Biddulph Brook. Increase in crime (criminal target estates) I strongly propose the proposed site. All the houses/bungalows backing onto the site will lose the light and privacy in there homes. It will reduce the value of my property. Loss of agricultural land. The current access (Marsh Green Road) does not meet the current standards for the SCC Highways. The sewage works is already overworked and the smell and the noise and the raw sewage flooding is current issue, the environment agency was called out in March 2016 to assist in the cleaning up the pollution.	• See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery. • See response to PO5827 regarding loss of wildlife. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • There is no evidence to suggest that development of this site would result in an increase in crime. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • See response to PO5940 regarding highways.
PO5379	Mr S Leese				BD062 / BD068	General comment	The sewage works cannot cope now so will not be able to with a new housing development. The road also will be very dangerous as increased traffic will be a threat to pedestrians who walk their children and their dogs along the railway tracks.	• See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO5940 regarding highways.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/G eneral	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5918	Mrs J Smith				BD062 / BD068	Object	I agree totally with the summary of objections over the page. Marsh Green Road is very narrow in parts and is a potential danger hazard already. I myself have had quite a few near misses and thought of increased residents/houses would be a fatality waiting to happen on this very narrow winding road. Access is not the only issue, the pipe work and sewage works are currently under capacitated so an increase to the residence population in this area would cause major issues with the smell + pollution in this area would cause major issues with the smell the pollution in this regard. Also build houses on Victoria Colliery + Childerplay Road sites.	• See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery.
PO6251	Ms S Wilson				BD062 / BD068	Object	Sewage works is already over worked and the smell noise and the raw sewage flooding is a current issue. Flooding last happened in March 2016 and the environment agency was called in to assist the clearing up. Green Belt – The site is currently Green Belt and has a lot of wildlife which includes birds, foxes, owls and bats also including this site would contradict SMDC LDF Proposed Site will be guided to first make use of the other areas. At low risk of flooding causing watercourse pollution within Biddulph Brook. Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road appear to be a better development sites. Highway access – The current access (Marsh Green Road) does not meet the current minimum SCC Highways. This is supported by the fire tender access to within 45m of the most distal aspect of the development cannot be guaranteed, due to narrow roads. It also contradicts SMDC LDF Core Strategy Policy T1. This site will deliver to few many homes to add any measurable contribution to the community infrastructure Levy CIL and will not bring any benefits to the Biddulph North Community. Current homes on Portland Drive will not only be reduced in value but the bungalows backing on the site will lose light and privacy will be greatly affected.	• See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO5940 regarding flooding. • See response to PO6527 regarding Green Belt. • See response to PO5827 regarding loss of wildlife. • See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery. • See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • See response to PO6260 regarding community benefit of development. • See response to PO6252 regarding property values and residential amenity.
PO6777 PO6774 PO6758 PO6773	Mrs J Banister Mr J Banister Mr A Forrester Mr K Flannagan				BD087, BD083, BD138b, BD004, BD064	Object	Object.	Comment noted.
PO6729	Mrs Gillian Flannagan				BD062, BD087, BD083, BD138b, BD138a, BD004, BD064	Object	BD062, BD087, BD083, BD138b, BD138a, BD004, BD064 all of these sites are Green Belt and should remain so, road structure not good enough at all, more appropriate sites available within the town boundaries.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on site BD062)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6229	Mrs S Goodwin				BD062/BD068	Object	Road is not adequate width for heavy vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement what pavement there is! Heavy vehicles turning in Marsh Green Road from Congleton Road there is not enough room very dangerous for the oncoming traffic already on the junction of Marsh Green Road. Aroma from the sewerage works is already unbearable is set to get much worse! Loss of natural beauty, loss of the wildlife, loss of privacy!	• See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO5827 regarding loss of wildlife. • See response to PO6252 regarding residential amenity.
PO6531	Mr Jeffrey Leese				BD068	Object	The access from Marsh Green Road is not wide enough to be safe for pedestrians. The number of houses is not enough to make any significant contribution to the overall numbers required. More suitable sites are the mills close to the town centre, the old Victoria Colliery site and the land off Childerplay Road.	• See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • Site BD062 will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes to benefit those in the community needing affordable housing. • See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery.
PO6529	Mr J Greatbatch				BD068	Object	I feel that there will be problems with traffic joining Congleton Road from out of Marsh Green Road. Even though we have been told no problems happen at the sewage section there are going to be a lot more properties going to it. The sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road seem more probable for housing a development.	• See response to PO5940 regarding highways. • See response to PO5940 regarding issues relating to the water treatment works. • See response to PO10246 regarding brownfield land including Victoria Colliery.
PO6253	Mr A Gresham				BD068	Object	I have only recently moved to this area and do not know enough information concerning the alternative site proposed for the development. I object to this proposed development site BD 068 – rear of Portland Drive.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO309 PO546	Mr Russell Picken Mrs C Picken				General	General comment	Building more houses will not necessarily improve the town. The town is still declining even though the 'Uplands Mill' development has (and will) provide a lot more residential accommodation. The bus service around the Pennine Way estate has reduced while this development has been ongoing. To attract more people into the town centre, the developments need to be within a few minutes walking distance, otherwise, if people need to use their cars, they are much more likely to go to the better shopping centres of Congleton or Hanley. This obviously also comes with an environmental impact. The only way to improve the town centre and associated retail opportunities is by attracting more people into the town to thereby stimulate growth.	Comments noted. The largest development area in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries document is on the west side of the bypass which is within a few minutes walking distance of the town centre.
PO650	Ms Alison Conybeare				General	General comment	Please seek the local resident's views. These are the most important.	Comments noted.
PO636	Mrs Amanda Reed				General	General comment	More consultation with Biddulph residents as a whole would be appreciated.	The Council is only part way through the plan production process. Further public consultation will take place before the plan is adopted. A Preferred Options Local Plan containing sites and policies will be published later in 2017 and full public consultation will follow. The final draft plan will then be published and representations invited from the public and any other interested parties before a public examination conducted by an independent planning inspector takes place and any objectors will have the opportunity to speak at a public hearing or submit written representations.
PO657 PO664	Mrs Siobhan Perry Mr Andrew Perry				General	Support	Biddulph is a great place to live, keep listening to residents, keep investing in the town centre and promoting Biddulph to encourage investments from shops and visitors.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1305	Ms Melanie Lindsley	Planning Liaison Manager The Coal Authority			General	General comment	(Summary) As you will be aware, the Staffordshire Moorlands area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting to approximately 22.07 of the Council area. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. The area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. Within the Plan area there are approximately 1,225 recorded mine entries and around 205 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. A range of other mining legacy features are present, in total The Coal Authority High Risk Development Area covers approximately 6.98% of the Council area. Mining legacy is concentrated in and around the Towns of Biddulph and Cheadle and many of the villages south-west of the A523. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. No development should take place over mine entries even when treated. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. In our previous response on the 14 September 2015 we stated: “In assessing potential site allocations, it would therefore be	- Sites affected by mining legacy to have a policy criterion to clarify that developers should recognise mining legacy problems and demonstrate how they can be positively addressed by new development. - Most recent GIS information from the Coal Authority has been downloaded and informs the site assessments.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							prudent to include a criterion which assesses coal mining data. In accordance with NPPF guidance (paras. 109, 120, 121 and 166), this would be a due diligence check to ensure that potential development sites do not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development. This assessment should be undertaken by the LPA using the GIS data provided by the Coal Authority. The Coal Authority notes that the Development Risk product and Surface Coal Resource product were downloaded by the LPA on the 8 June 2015. The LPA should use the most up to date information available to inform its assessments.” I note and welcome the fact that the site assessment documents covering the site options does identify ground instability arising from mining legacy and as such The Coal Authority supports the broad approach taken to site selection. We have no views on the actual sites chosen as this is a matter for local determination following consideration of all relevant factors.	
PO442	Mrs Janice Deane				General	Object	Biddulph is a close a supportive community. It cannot grow without that becoming unbalanced.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1330	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			General	Object	Not all the proposed allocation sites have had ecological surveys carried out. We understand around 11 sites have been added to the proposed allocation sites that were not consulted upon in 2015, and these have not been assessed for their ecological value. The SMDC Local Plan Policy C3 Sustainable Communities - Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 and 8.7.17 references the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, which “ will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” No Green Infrastructure Strategy has as yet been produced. Therefore, we are concerned that this lack of evidence base will not enable good decisions to be made on allocation sites. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys carried out by Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd in 2015 do not comprehensively cover all natural features that the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance list as needing to be mapped as part of ecological networks: the location and extent of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites; Existing designated sites are recognised, but identification of all Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is not as yet comprehensive. In terms of potential allocation sites, there are several where information from the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, other ecological survey reports for planning applications, and habitat data from MAGIC indicate potentially high value habitats, which should be assessed against the Staffordshire Local Wildlife Sites criteria. the distribution of protected and priority habitats and species; Priority habitats and species are taken to mean those listed as habitats or species of Principal Importance for Conservation in England according to the list under section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, plus those listed on the Staffordshire, and any more local, Biodiversity Action Plan. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys do provide data that would allow identification of some priority habitats, but do not highlight priority habitats where they are present or use the definitions to describe habitats found. Recommendations for further protected and priority species surveys are made, but full information on their presence has not been gathered. areas of irreplaceable natural habitat , such as ancient woodland or limestone pavement, the significance of which may be derived from habitat age, uniqueness, species diversity and/or the impossibilities of re-creation; This includes veteran trees and ancient hedgerows. Records for these features are not comprehensive. Some veteran tree records are available on http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap It does not appear that this database was searched in the desk studies informing the habitat surveys in 2014. The survey reports do	Ecus Ltd have now completed ecological assessment of all sites includes in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries (April 2016) consultation. A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next Preferred Options consultation.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							not specifically mention irreplaceable habitats. habitats where specific land management practices are required for their conservation; Some mention is made of current land management in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, but important areas are not highlighted. main landscape features which, due to their linear or continuous nature, are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchanges of plants and animals, including any potential for new habitat corridors to link any isolated sites that hold nature conservation value, and therefore improve species dispersal; Good habitat links and recommended buffer areas are mentioned in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, and the information within the surveys could be used to identify corridors and stepping stones, but specific identification of these features is not part of the report or clearly and consistently highlighted. Corridors and stepping stones need to be recognised and protected, and their other benefits to visual and access amenity in urban areas recognised. areas with potential for habitat enhancement or restoration, including those necessary to help biodiversity adapt to climate change or which could assist with the habitats shifts and species migrations arising from climate change; The ecology surveys would help identify such areas, and some Visual Open Space and Public Open Space areas are proposed in the allocations plans, but areas to be enhanced in terms of habitat value are not specifically identified. information on the biodiversity and geodiversity value of previously developed sites and the opportunities for incorporating this in developments; Previously developed sites are among those proposed for allocation and covered by ecological surveys, which give some recommendations. However geodiversity is not covered. If ecological networks and other GI features could be mapped for each settlement, this would give a good basis for allocating sites, both for hard development, and for green space and environmental enhancements. This would also provide a framework for any CL monies, partnership projects etc. to target priorities in the area and improve the environmental quality of each town and village.	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1373	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			General	General comment	Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This means that the plan, as a whole (including the sites it is putting forward as allocations) has to set out a framework which is likely to conserve the historic environment of the Plan area. The Plan puts forward a number of sites which, if developed, appear likely to affect the significance of one or more designated heritage assets in their vicinity. The Allocation of a site for development within the Local Plan is, in effect, establishing that the principle of development in that particular location is acceptable. However, in the case of this Local Plan, at present, there is no clear meaningful evaluation of what impact the development of these areas might have upon those heritage assets. The evidence base relies on the Historic Environment Character Assessment of 2010 and the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (LSCA) of 2008 amongst others. It is also noted that the SHLAA methodology includes reference to constraints and opportunities in relation to the LSCA but does not mention the Historic Environment Character Assessment. In addition, it is noted that the Halcrow Toolkit of 2011 used for the Core Strategy information has been used in respect of the current SHLAA. Table 2.1 of the site rating criteria includes reference to designated heritage assets, but there is no reference to non-designated heritage assets, setting or harm. As such, it is not clear how impact on the historic environment has been assessed and subsequently applied to the site options in relation to them being put forward as allocation sites, other than where mentioned in the associated SA. Even in the SA it is not clear how the sites have been assessed in respect of the historic environment. It is also of concern that Para 1.16 of the draft plan sets out that further evidence base studies will be completed to inform the Local Plan including Landscape and Heritage Impact Study. In the Options Sites Assessments tables, part of the evidence base, it is also noted that Heritage Impact Assessments will be undertaken during the plan production if sites, where negative effect on the historic environment and heritage assets has been identified, are taken forward. These assessments should be undertaken and considered at this stage to ensure that the preferred allocation sites are deliverable in respect of the historic environment but, at present, Part 7 of the SA does not deal with this. In the absence of any assessment of the degree of harm which the proposed Allocations might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the authority cannot	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage impacts of the development allocations and mitigation measures.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							demonstrate that the sites it is putting forward for development is compatible with the Plan's own policies for the protection of the historic environment. Moreover, in terms of national policy guidance, the Plan also fails to demonstrate that:- (a) The sites that it is putting forward for development will deliver a "positive strategy for the historic environment" as is required by NPPF Paragraph 126. (b) The sites that are allocated will be likely to "contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment". Therefore, it has not shown that it is likely to deliver sustainable development in terms of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 7]. (c) The sites which it has allocated are likely to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance". Therefore it has not shown that it will be likely to deliver the Government's objectives for the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 17]. (d) It has complied with the statutory duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas. Moreover, from the information available there is no evidence that, in preparing the Plan, the local planning authority has had "special regard to the desirability of preserving" any of its Listed Buildings. Whilst it is accepted that S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 does not apply, specifically, to Plan making, the absence of any evaluation potentially brings into question the deliverability of some sites and, for some, the amount of development they can accommodate. When the requirements of the Act are eventually undertaken, it may be found that the quantum of development on some of the sites is, either, unachievable or, at worst, that the need to safeguard the setting of the building actually renders them largely undevelopable. Please note that these comments are based on known heritage assets at a national level and do not include local information available through heritage environment records which should be considered by the local authority.	
PO972	Mr Christopher Goldstraw				General	Object	Biddulph will never need 1,100 new houses. There are already a substantial number of empty properties in the town that should be brought back into use.	Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however, these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO1148	Darren Archer				General	Object	Why should we be dictated to by Stafford County Council and have 880 plus houses built in Biddulph along the bypass. Which is all green belt land. Woodland and full of nature. Over 200 of these properties will be for affordable housing. With anti social people coming from other counties and possibly immigration. If the cannot be housed in the area they are from why should local people who have lived in Biddulph all there lives have a new estate on there doorstep. Full of non desirables. Biddulph is a commuting town with no industry any more thanks to government for someone to use google maps to say yes we will build there is absurd. And all the community will object. If anyone from this department would like to contact me. Please feel free and explain what idiot came up with this suggestion. Please forward me their details. Many thanks.	• See response to PO972 (above) regarding need for housing. • Staffordshire County Council do not stipulate the housing numbers for Staffordshire Moorlands. This is determined by evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment in line with Government policy. • New employment areas are also proposed for Biddulph in the draft Local Plan. • Decisions as to the content of the Council's Local Plan are made by elected Councillors.
PO2579	Consultation Service	Natural England			General	General comment	With regard to baseline data and additional new sites: The Council may need to check that up to date information on local wildlife sites (Sites of Biological Interest and Biodiversity Alert Sites in Staffordshire) has been referenced when identifying preferred sites. Our previous advice letter dated 14.9.15 gave detailed advice on themes and issues including these non-statutory sites. Natural England no longer has access to this dataset and the as the preferred sites consultation includes a number of additional sites (not considered as part of last year's consultation) the Council will need to access up to date information to check on any impacts on these sites. Please contact the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (01889 880 100 or email info@staffswt.org.uk) for further information if you do not hold the relevant dataset in house.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2695	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General	Object	There is no commentary around the issue of flood risk and how the sites have been chosen with the Sequential process in mind. However, we do note that the sites we previously identified as being the most severely impacted due to flood risk, have not been taken forward to this stage, which we welcome. We have however, identified some sites where further work is necessary and we wish to remind the Local Planning Authority that Sequential Test evidence should be provided and reiterate if these sites are to be taken forward, then a Level 2 SFRA should also be undertaken. At this Preferred Options stage, this work should already be done. However, there is one final chance for this to be undertaken, prior to the Publication Draft towards the end of this year. If it is not done by that stage, the Site Allocation Document risks being found unsound as it will be at odds with the guidance set out in the SFRA Level 1 and potentially, Flood Risk policies that will be set out in the next consultation.	Comments noted. The sites in Biddulph included in the 'Preferred Sites and Boundaries Consultation Document' (April 2016) where flood zone issues were identified, have been recommended for exclusion from the plan so they are unlikely to be taken forward and those which have been recommended for inclusion do not have flood zone issues (subject to decision taken at Council Assembly on 12 th July 2017).
PO2832	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General	General comment	The appropriate level and detail of ecological appraisal should be provided for any developments going forward on the proposed site allocations. These should be completed to CIEEM guidelines namely to identify and evaluate the ecological features of interest and potential impacts upon them. The mitigation hierarchy should be employed from the outset of any design and development planning to avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset impacts, both direct and indirect. Many proposed allocations are adjacent to priority habitats and statutory and non-statutory designated sites, including watercourses. In line with the mitigation hierarchy and relevant NPPF sections, i.e. 109, every effort should be made to re-naturalize watercourses, including de-culverting where technically feasible. The main impact on any sites from a developable point of view, are easements from watercourses to help promote Green and Blue corridors and networks where migration and movement along the watercourse banks can occur. This is likely to be between 5 metres, up to 10 metres on some main river stretches. Impacts on water quality need to be assessed, particularly the cumulative impact to ensure the relevant WFD waterbodies do not deteriorate in status and listed measures in the RBMP are taken into account. Collective contributions from specific areas could be used to support innovative land management schemes upstream in the catchment delivering natural flood management to reduce flood risk in the new developments and wider communities downstream. We would recommend and welcome the opportunity to comment on pre-applications to ensure the best opportunities and outcomes are realised.	Comments noted. Policies for sites affected by watercourses should require that early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority are undertaken.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2858	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General	General comment	Whilst we have not assessed each site in detail it is clear that many of them will be crossed by public rights of way which will need to be considered in full as part of any proposed development. We are also in the process of preparing the 4th Review of the Definitive Map and Statement for Staffordshire Moorlands area and the District Council will be provided with copies of the maps and Statement to indicate the alignment of all recorded routes. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council currently hold copies of the existing Definitive Map and Statement which should form part of any discussions with developers regarding the proposed sites. As the Plan progresses we suggest policy provision to ensure that all public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development. If any Public Path Orders are required to enable the development to take place these should be processed alongside the planning application by the District Council. Many of the sites chosen are close to existing urban areas and it is likely that there are non-definitive routes across the sites which should be considered by any applicants. In many cases these routes could have become rights of way by virtue of established usage over many years and should be treated as public. There will also be sites where such usage or historic evidence has already resulted in applications being made to the County Council under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. As the Plan evolves it would be useful to provide guidance to developers/applicants around enhancing the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include: - the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists across Staffordshire where there is currently a shortfall in available access routes. - the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking - the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture The County Council is able to provide further advice and guidance as and when required.	Comments noted. Text has been added to the supporting text associated with relevant Biddulph site policies to reflect the protection and, where possible, enhancement of public rights of way in conjunction with any development, though it is recognised that they may have to be re-directed.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2880	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General	General comment	In relation to more general matters regarding the Local Plan's approach and considering the incorporation of policies for the next iteration the following should be considered. A Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) has previously been prepared for the Staffordshire Moorlands and its focus and extent was informed through discussion with the District Council. The statement regarding the need for further evidence including a 'Heritage Impact Study' (s1.16) of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan booklet is to be supported and should also be welcomed by Historic England. This Heritage Impact Study should review the previous work of the HEA (and update where required), extend the boundaries of the previous study where necessary and enhance the assessment where appropriate. It should cover all aspects of the historic environment and be undertaken by a suitably experienced historic environment specialist following a detailed brief agreed in advance with Historic England, the SMDC Conservation Team and the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team. We have not assessed each site in detail as it is considered that the Heritage Impact Study (identified in s1.16) will undertake this work with reference to all relevant documentary information and databases (Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Record, National Heritage List for England etc). The Heritage Impact Study should also make use of all available recent studies to inform its assessment including, where appropriate, the relevant Extensive Urban Survey (available on www.staffordshire.gov.uk/ search under EUS) and the historic farmsteads guidance available on the same web pages. Bearing in mind the scale of many of these developments, where appropriate applicants should be encouraged to undertake, as a minimum, a Heritage Statement in support of any application in order to '...describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' (NPPF, s.128). Where more complex remains or larger developments are being considered, then a full Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment should be prepared. In all cases these documents should be prepared at an early stage by appropriately experienced historic environment specialists and they will inform discussions with the Local Planning Authority and their historic environment advisors regarding the need for and scale of any historic environment interventions including opportunities (where appropriate) to enhance heritage assets within a scheme. The Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team would be happy to be consulted by the historic environment	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage impacts of the development allocations.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							specialist appointed to undertake the Heritage Impact Study. We would also be content to advise on the production of Heritage Statements/Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments to inform development proposals and can advise the LPA on, in particular, the archaeological and historic landscape character aspects of specific developments at the planning application stage.	
PO2928	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General	General comment	In relation to surface water flood risk you have provided to us recently a GIS mapping layer of the proposed allocations that we have run through our flood risk software. Attached are our initial comments on the sites and it is hoped that these should help identify any potential issues at each site and assist in framing policy for assessment and SuDS requirements. However, we have only been able to undertake a high level initial assessment at this stage and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you further and perhaps identify sites that require further detailed consideration.	Comments noted. Further discussions have been held with SCC regarding flooding issues.
PO5272	Mr Carl Webb				General	Object	Building will put even more strain on Biddulph increase pollution and destroy green belt and wildlife and bio diversity.	Comment noted.
PO5096 PO5095	Mr J Neate Mrs L Neate				General	General comment	All the advantages should be explored and approved.	Comment noted.
PO5218	Mrs L McQuade				General	Support	We have been waiting 12 months join the gym class at the leisure centre. More opportunities needed.	Comment noted. However, this is not a matter which can be directly addressed in the Local Plan.
PO5247	Mrs P G Webb				General	Support	New primary school is desperately needed/I strongly support the proposals here.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7310	Ms Joan Walley				General	Object	I feel strongly that strategic issues arising from the earlier consultation response and including my own comments have not been fully considered. Even more disconcerting for local democracy is the concern expressed that local councillors' views have not been acted upon. My specific comments are as follows. * Future Housing and Retail Need in Biddulph I do not consider that sufficient detailed assessment has been done to enable SMDC to arrive at a definitive assessment of future housing and retail need in Biddulph. What account has been taken of future housing trends, the need of the aging population, the extent of existing vacant and derelict properties, audit and ownership of more suitable town centre sites for potential development or reuse, and of the implications of this assessment for new build housing and retail? For example, what future sheltered housing provision is required; to what extent is the new build at Selectus meeting local housing need; what account has been taken of vacant shops in the town centre? Without this detailed analysis and breakdown of the type of new properties and retail required it is difficult to see how the required figure of 885 properties is arrived at, or the need for new retail. *Greenbelt, Without a detailed review of the value of greenbelt and impact of any removal of green belt, and with no full biodiversity / natural capital assessment, I do not agree that there is a case that there are exceptional circumstances that would merit release of the green belt sites in Biddulph identified in the plan and also to the overall cumulative extent outlined in the plan. Biddulph's development is very much linked to its geography and historic mineral resources and it is important that the settlement should remain distinctive, separated by greenbelt from the settlements in Biddulph Moor, Mow Cop, and from sites such as the Woodland Trust's at Baileys wood, and that urban sprawl should be avoided. I particularly object to the the later addition of the Akemoor Lane site ADD03 for house building and a new school. I suggest that the reduction of the overall number of planned new houses for this site would be short term in any case and development there of the reduced number of homes would be temporary and sequential, leading inevitably to a future 'joining of the lines on the map', encroaching even further into the green belt in the future. Given that local councillors and people have repeatedly called for a brown field site first approach to avoid unnecessary despoiling why will the Council not assess the suitability of existing unused sites and undertake a full appraisal of the suitability of the former Victoria colliery site for housing in the first instance? Infrastructure It is difficult to see from paragraphs 327	• It is not agreed that sufficient detailed assessment of housing and retail need has not been undertaken. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Retail Study are considered to be robust. • The Staffordshire Moorlands Green Belt Review provides a detailed assessment of all the Green Belt in the District by splitting it into parcels and undertaking detailed analysis of each parcel. It is considered that this assessment follows a robust and credible methodology. • Phase 1 Ecological Assessment has now been undertaken for all sites in the 'Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries' document. These sites have also been considered against 'Local Wildlife Criteria' to assess which may qualify as 'Sites of Biological Importance'. • A Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy has been produced by the Council in partnership with key organisations (such as the County Council and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust). This will be published alongside the Preferred Options Local Plan for comments. • Brownfield sites in and around Biddulph have been assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and included in the plan where they are suitable, available and viable. • Other sites suggested through the consultation have also been assessed including the former Victoria Colliery site. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							onwards and linked papers exactly how the Plan's proposals have taken full account of the requirements in the NPPF to assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet local demands. Can SMDC set out what assessment they and the Environment Agency have made in respect of future sewage infrastructure investment requirements for existing and future housing development in Biddulph? Please can SMDC set out what account has been taken of flooding on each of the sites included for development? Please can SMDC also set out in detail what traffic modelling has been undertaken in respect of the existing transport infrastructure and implications for all proposed new development, and particularly that on the west side of the Biddulph Valley? There appears to be no reference to traffic and pedestrian safety for access to and from the town centre and other sites in an area already lacking basic safety measures including pavements and traffic controls. Any site for a new school should have safe vehicular and pedestrian access. In conclusion I strongly object to SMDC's approach to this Local Plan housing allocation for Biddulph which appears to be based more on a remote desk top paper exercise rather than a genuine understanding of and response to local views, local geography, and economic, social and environmental needs and considerations. I accept that a Plan has to be adopted, but there is still time for officers to take account of the views of local people and their elected ward councillors.	infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development and they consider that there is no need to expand the treatment works in the development plan period for the growth identified in the development plan. • The Council has had an on-going dialogue with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Officer at Staffordshire County Council regarding flood risk. • The Council has had an on-going dialogue with highway officers at Staffordshire County Council and they have provided site specific information to inform the site selection process.
PO5301	Mr S Findlow				General	General comment	The elderly residents of the Pennine Way estate + the Washington Close area desperately need a round robin' mini bus service to help to get to the doctors and the shops and the dentist etc.: say from 9am – 3pm, it could be enterprising taxi service to set this up to help the elderly attend appointments. I strongly feel that the health infrastructure would be under great strain with such an increase in the population. I work at the local dental practice and we simply cannot cope with any more patients. We have to turn people away on a daily basis.	Comments noted. Provision for community transport is outside the remit of the Local Plan. See response to PO7310 regarding infrastructure.
PO6724	Ms Jenna Wooliscroft				General	Object	I would just like to respond to the new planning application in biddulph, I am against building in our beautiful green belt that is home to many animals, walkers, bikers etc.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9244 PO9276	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	General	Object	With regard to the proposed distribution of housing across the district, we would support a greater proportion of housing being allocated to Biddulph mindful that we consider that the allocation of additional land for housing in Biddulph would also enhance the prospects of the open market and affordable housing needs of the town (and in turn the district) being met within the plan period, which would in turn support the delivery of sustainable communities in terms of both meeting housing needs and supporting local services. It is also considered that there would be sustainable benefits and justification for increasing the housing allocations in Biddulph, given the good range of existing services in the town. There would also be knock-on benefits from provision of additional housing to that currently proposed in the town. Such benefits would include local economic benefits through additional spending in the town centre and at other local facilities and ultimately additional support for the future sustainability and growth of local services. Further justification for increasing the housing allocations in Biddulph is the fact that it is proposed to allocate employment and mixed alternative use sites in Biddulph. The delivery of more homes in Biddulph in tandem with the job creation associated with those site allocations would enhance the sustainability of the local area, including by providing increased opportunity for existing and future employees at businesses within Biddulph to live locally (therefore reducing the need to travel). It is considered that the delivery of more homes in and around Biddulph would be more sustainable than allocating land within the Green Belt for housing in locations elsewhere that are more remote from the employment opportunities and other range of services that are available in the larger settlements such as Biddulph.	The Council's Objectively Assessed Housing Needs were agreed at Council Assembly on 8th March 2017. The agreed figure is an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) is taken forward on the basis that the scenario: • Most closely accords with the housing policy set out in the NPPF as it fully meets demographic housing needs and helps to address the affordable housing need. It also increases the scope to provide specialist housing such as Self-Build and Custom Build • Supports the provision of approximately 870 additional jobs up to the year 2031. This will help to set a positive economic strategy for the District in line with to Paragraph 21 of the NPPF • With a pro-active approach to delivery taken by the Council, is "aspirational, but realistic" when considered in the context of an historic average delivery rate of 178 homes per year • Is deliverable in terms of the supply of suitable housing land, the scope to release land from the Green Belt and infrastructure capacity • Is consistent with the requirement agreed by the Council in 2016. The majority of sites required for this level of development were not found to give rise to significant landscape or heritage impacts, including on the setting of the Peak District National Park • Provides a balanced range of social, economic and environmental effects as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal the most consistent with the four aims of the Corporate Plan (2015-2019) when read as a whole. The proportion of the OAN applied to Biddulph is the same as set out in the adopted Core Strategy, 20%.
PO9055	Mrs Joyce Tagell			Hourigan Connolly	General	Object	(Further document attached). APPORTIONMENT OF HOUSING It is noted that the Council has not invited comment on the distribution of development amongst the District and relies upon the apportionment contained within Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy. In respect of housing this	See response above.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							proposes that Biddulph accommodates 20% of the housing requirement. B IDDULPH – HOUSING REQUIREMENT ADJUSTED FOR BARTON WILLMORE FOAHN Given the work undertaken by Barton Willmore it is necessary to illustrate the effect of utilising a 440 dwelling per annum requirement (8,360 dwellings for the Plan period) on the need to identify further land for housing. In that respect and adopting the 20% apportionment advocated by the Council Biddulph would need to accommodate 1,672 dwellings over the Plan period 2012 – 2031 (8,360 x 20%). Table 3.2 of the Council's Preferred Options document states that as of 31 December 2015 156 dwellings had been completed since 2012 and there were commitments for a further 155 dwellings (311 in total). Against a requirement of 1,672 dwellings for the settlement this leaves a residual requirement of 1,361 dwellings. Accordingly, we object to the residual requirement of 885 dwellings as shown in Table 3.2 of the Preferred Options document and consider that this should be increased to 1,361 dwellings. Table 4.6 of the Preferred Options document illustrates how the residual Plan requirement for Biddulph is going to be met. However, adopting the 1,361 residual requirement established in Chapter 4 it is evident that even if all sources of potential supply as set out in the Council's Table 4.6 were accepted (which they are not) then only 888 additional dwellings are to be provided for. In other words against the 1,361 residual requirement we favour the Council need to identify land to accommodate at least a further 473 dwellings (1,361 – 888). It is notable that of the 888 dwellings identified by the Council to meet development needs 335 are within the Core Strategy Broad Area 4 and 440 dwellings comprise allocations – urban extensions. The remainder is reliant on a Large Windfall site allowance of 20 dwellings and a small sites allowance of 150. The entire supply is then subject to an 89 dwelling slippage allowance. Further, the small sites allowance of 150 is attributed to each of the three town's totalling 450 dwellings over the plan period. Biddulph is surrounded by Green Belt, Leek and Cheadle are also constrained by Green Belt on their western edges. Historic delivery of housing has been demonstrably low due to constraints such as Green Belt and environmental designations resulting in a very low reservoir of planning permissions. The over reliance on large windfalls and small sites across the Plan area is unjustified and will result in a failure of the Plan to meet housing needs. The 150 dwellings small sites allowance for Biddulph is totally unjustified.	
PO9824	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				General	Object	At present Biddulph is not a well-balanced town. This must be put right and the only way to do this is to develop the	Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are within the Green Belt. The Green Belt

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							west and south of the town sympathetically using less contentious parts, providing the opportunity to build the number of houses required. Most residents favour the development of the Victoria Colliery site. The neighbouring Newcastle Authority appears to be in favour. The area would be greatly improved and a large number of houses could be built and there would be CIL benefits. Also favoured are Childerplay Lane and south of ADD03 / west of BD076.	Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy. The area south of ADD03 / west of BD076 is being considered as a potential development site by the Council.
PO10206	Mr Stan Charlesworth				General	General comment	Summary only (see attached full representation) Do not agree with the suggestion from a Councillor to reopen the railway line between Biddulph and Stoke. It would not be cost effective.	Comment noted.
PO10221	Mr Stuart Nicholls				General	Object	I strongly disagree that Biddulph needs the number of new properties allocated as there are not enough employers or employment for such numbers of people in Biddulph. If the extra numbers of people are to find employment in Stoke on Trent then there are numerous brownfield sites within 5 to 10 miles south west of Biddulph. Whilst I understand that the Neighbourhood Plan must designate the land by the Government's directive there are many brownfield alternatives a few miles away.	- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. - An assessment of employment land requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land was required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. It was recommended and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that an annual housing requirement of 320 homes per year (close to combined jobs growth scenario) was taken forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan. An employment land requirement of approximately 27ha was therefore recommended up to the year 2031 for the Preferred Options Local Plan on the basis that it was at the top of the OAN range for employment and so closely corresponds with the proposed housing requirement to support sustainable development. Applying

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								the 20% requirement for Biddulph wards in Pol SS3 Core Strategy gives a requirement for the town of at least 5.4ha, less qualifying 2014-17 employment commitments. A range of employment site choices have been selected for Biddulph – either close to the town centre or to the existing Victoria Business Park. National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke and Newcastle Councils have their own development needs to meet.
PO9976	Ms Ashley Kirkham				General	General comment	I understand that Biddulph needs to take control through the Neighbourhood Plan or risk developments running wild as has happened in other places. I have lived in Biddulph all my life and it seems as though the east side of Biddulph has been almost routinely developed with housing. It seems logical to me to balance things up by developing on the west.	The area south of ADD03 / west of BD076 is being considered as a potential development site by the Council.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10220	Mr Ian Evans				General	Support	Filling out on west side of town would give a better balance to the town. Question if Biddulph really needs new housing. Properties on east side. Better road lines on west side of town - Biddulph bypass - looks like it was planned to support the expected housing for Biddulph. A more attractive structure could be built on the west side of Biddulph. A greater sympathetic development could be created with good access - Marsh Green Lane, Mow Lane, Station Road, Wharf Road, New Pool Road. Nature: new development can be better screened from the railway track naturally (bd016, bd055, bd071, bd071a, bd106, bd156 & bd108) makes a wider nature corridor. Has advantages; natural screening, better pedestrian access to biddulph reducing car demand, close to health centre, opportunity for older person dwellings close to town centre, close to proposed care home, sports ground etc - thus reducing traffic flows/volumes. It will accommodate new school, accessible by foot, safer dropping off children. (ox hay school was on chaotic roads with parked cars). All of the above demonstrates good sustainable locations, achieving smdc sustainability vision. All above will achieve and support the regeneration of Biddulph town centre - making biddulph an attractive and safe environment to live and work. Building on west side of valley will be closer to potential business developments at the old chatterley whitfield mining sites. It will also be closer to planned new employment areas than other sites. This will make walking to work attractive - thus reducing traffic congestion/pollution.	- See response to PO10221 regarding housing need for Biddulph. - See response to PO9976 regarding building on the west side of Biddulph.
PO9978	Ms Carol Ann Nixon				General	Object	Why can't the 15 year plan be divided into 885 houses so that less than 60 houses per year could be built which would have least impact on the town and the 5 year stock would never run out and cause less stress for residents.	Comments noted. Although this seems like a logical solution in theory, the Council cannot in planning law limit the number of houses which can be built per year.
PO273	Mr Christopher Hall					Support	Support.	Comment noted.
PO294	Mr David Spruce					Support	This plan supports the regeneration of Biddulph and gives a better balance to the shape of the town. It provides dwellings close to the town centre and good access via the bypass.	Comment noted.
PO5288	Mrs S Purcell					Support	I agree	Comment noted.
PO5309	Mr and Mrs A. Hodgkinson					Support	All these comments are sensible and constructive, and we agree with them completely.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (General Comments)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5174	Mr S Sneyd					Support	I support	Comment noted.
PO5209	Miss F McQuade					Support	I support this	Comment noted.
PO5271	Mrs A Bridgette					Support	Regeneration.	Comment noted.
PO6762	Mr A Lehepoo					Object	I agree with the following objections overleaf	Comment noted.
PO6761	Mrs V Jackson					Object	I agree with the summary of objections attached.	Comment noted.
PO5895	Mrs B Bainbridge					General comment	Yes to suggestions you agree with	Comment noted.
PO157 PO165	Mrs Beverley Webb Mr Barrington Webb				Infrastructure	Object	Current infrastructure is already over-stretched. It is felt that the housing allocation for Biddulph is excessive considering newly built properties on the old Selectus factory site do not appear to be selling to private buyers with a considerable proportion being sold to Housing associations. All the proposed development appears to be targeted in the North and West Wards.	• See response to PO7310 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO10221 regarding need for housing in Biddulph. • Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however, these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO617	Mrs Ellen Faulkner				Infrastructure	Object	Biddulph does not need any more housing until the infrastructure as been improved to deal with a growing population. If you have to build, choose to improve brown field sites first. Try to leave the Green Belt alone.	• See response to PO7310 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO10221 regarding need for housing in Biddulph. • See response to PO7310 regarding use of brown field land and the Green Belt. • There is not enough land outside of the Green Belt to meet Biddulph's housing needs to 2031.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10025	Mr & Mrs D Cartwright				Green Belt	General comment	What has happened to the Green Belt being safe from developers? Concerned about the Green Belt area between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor.	The Council's Green Belt Review has recommended that the area between Biddulph and Biddulph Moor is retained as Green Belt and not considered for development.
PO36	Mr E Shaw				Green Belt	General comment	The town of Biddulph is a growing town situated within a semi rural location, the needs of a growing town have to be met, yet the infrastructure of the lack space to create further road and rail links due to the isolated location compared to The Potteries and Congleton. Therefore, developing the town further in to the Green Belt will only create further frustrating problems for the residents of all ages that have to travel far to their place of work or higher education. Some parts of the town in the South have better road links to the A500 and some brown field land that can be used for housing and further development.	National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO513	Mr Denver Johnson				Green Belt	Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices.	Comments noted. Refer to PO692 (below).
PO692	Mr Ian Turner				Green Belt	General comment	As a resident of Gillow Heath and Biddulph for 16 years, I feel very let down by the changing in status of green belt land in order to accommodate some of these proposals. Proposing these changes whilst the centre of Biddulph is decaying from within, with underutilisation of existing retail premises and brown field sites is a disgrace.	- In order for Biddulph to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). Whichever site(s) are selected as a housing allocation, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt. - Brown field sites have been considered as part of the site selection process and it is agreed that the mills in the centre of Biddulph (particularly Yarn Mill and Minster Mill) would be appropriate for residential development. Albion Mill on Station Road is too small for an allocation of its own but if it is developed it would count towards Biddulph's housing needs. The Biddulph Neighbourhood Planning Group are currently working on a Town Centre Masterplan which includes looking at opportunities for redeveloping

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								brownfield sites.
PO558	Mrs Angela Turner				Green Belt	General comment	The landscape running through and around Biddulph is one of its' major assets. Most of this is currently classed as Green Belt. It is highly unsustainable to simply remove this designation to make land available for building when other areas of the District have non Green Belt land available for development. In order to achieve the aims of 'Sustainable Development', which balances economic, environmental and social benefits I call for SMDC to reconsider and revisit the arbitrary 20% figure to make this more suitable for a town with little urban development space (non-green belt) and poor links to areas of employment.	- See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt. - The 20% figure is set out in the Council's Core Strategy, a planning document which has been through consultation and an examination by an independent inspector.
PO76	Mrs Marilyn Griffiths				Green Belt	General comment	Biddulph is currently a very good place to live, it would be better if all current green belt land remains as is	See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt.
PO21	Mr Robert Moseley				Green Belt	Object	No further encroachment into Greenbelt land should be made a more imaginative solution to the housing needs of the people of Biddulph should be made. Looking at empty homes, local homes for local people!, freeing up any by to let that is restricting home ownership, alternative accomodation solutions. There is a great big disused Mill on Station road that could easily become a number of houses.	- See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt. - See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites including mills. - Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council's own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands.
PO86	Mr Robert Moseley				Green Belt	Object	Develop brown field not green belt.	See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites including mills.
PO145	Mr Carl Webb				Green Belt	Object	Brownfield sites should be used instead of green belt	See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites including mills.
PO241	Mr Robert Stockley				Green Belt	Object	Erosion of the Green Belt is of primary concern to me, we should protect the green belt at all costs to preserve of Beautiful Biddulph Valley.	See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO348	Miss Gemma Docksey				Green Belt	Object	RE: ADD03 I am aware of the reduction from the original plans on the Akeshire Lane site (ADD03) from 300 house to 60 whilst this is a more manageable number the placement within the site and access for traffic does need careful consideration. I do believe if this site allocation was to go ahead, access from off the bypass would be a better idea as I have mentioned in my previous comments. The reduction in the housing number for this area I do feel needs further confirmation, what reassurance do we have that this number would not rise again, seeming as the number was reduced with no comment as to why and done before public consultation, are people even aware this was the original plan? Are we to have another consultation if the numbers change again? My other concern is the amount of housing that is being developed in the Gillow Heath Area, bearing in mind we have already had housing developments in the area, Brook Gardens, and Smokies Way for example. I do feel there are other areas of Biddulph which could share the load so to speak, as Biddulph is a "Garden Town" the destruction of our Green Belt is criminal. I understand that we have been allotted this number of houses to be built but I feel that it could be done in a more sympathetic way without marring the beauty of our town.	- Suitable access to any site is agreed with County Highways. - Two further rounds of consultation will take place on the contents of the Local Plan and a hearing in front of an independent inspector before it is adopted.
PO1109	Ann Wright				Green Belt	Object	Why not use brown field sites in Biddulph before using green belt? Like the old pit site which was classed as green belt, was industrial until recently and was stabilized for building on. Unlike the land in Akeshire Lane which may increase flooding in the valley. Brown field sites in Biddulph should also be used before green belt land.	- See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites including mills. - Sites at Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road are also within the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review has considered the impact on the Green Belt the release of these sites for development would have. Only the Victoria Colliery site was identified as being suitable for consideration for Green Belt release (in exceptional circumstances). In reaching a decision on which sites to include in the Local Plan, the Council must balance evidence and Government policy.
PO4844	Mrs Harper				Green Belt	Object	Object to building on Green Belt area. Also the impact of additional traffic on an already very busy main road at Knypersley	- See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt. - The Highway Authority has no difficulties with the principle of development in this location. Improvements needed to the road network as a result of development would need to be identified through a Transport Assessment.
PO752	Mr Paul Malkin				Green Belt	Object	Save Biddulphs Green Belt Firstly I would again like to comment that the Councils marketing of this consultation has been extremely poor, it has been left to residents' associations and concerned residents to spread the bad news in their community. As council tax notices were sent to all residents a few weeks prior to the consultation starting then I would have expected the promotion of an important issue like this to have been included in that delivery. I feel SMDC have missed a real opportunity to work in partnership with neighbouring	- The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Biddulph residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. - National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Stoke on Trent City Council has its own development needs to

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							authorities to produce a North Staffordshire plan that could deliver the required housing whilst protecting green belt and identifying brownfield sites to continue to regenerate the area. When I asked if this had been considered at the Biddulph consultation meeting the council officer advised me that this had not been considered as "nobody wants to live in Stoke". I find this attitude from a council officer pretty appalling and if this is the attitude of the planning team then no wonder an innovative partnership approach had not been considered. Stoke have been successfully regenerating and redeveloping brownfield sites in the area for many years and I believe SMDC could learn a lot from their approach. In addition Stoke and Newcastle are where the job opportunities are being created and many residents of Staffordshire Moorlands will travel there for work and leisure and probably would want to live in these areas. The proposed sites for development are not only in green belt areas, but also along the boundaries of existing residents. The sites are going to have a detrimental impact on current council tax payers of the district who purchased properties at an inflated rate due to overlooking beautiful open fields. These residents are not only going to lose their beautiful views but also thousands of pounds from the value of their homes. I propose a number of sites that will have a minimal impact on the green belt and current residents. The Mills in Station Road and Walley Street are in desperate need of repair or regeneration. These could either be developed into apartments for young first time buyers or older persons or demolished and new properties built. This accommodation is far better situated close to the town centre and will keep the area more in keeping of the newer properties around them. There is also old brownfield land available either side of Congleton Road in Knypersley, the former Victoria Colliery site and the land behind Bemersley recycling centre off Childerplay Road. All of these sites have much better access to the main roads than the proposed sites that are all reliant on single track country lanes. What is required locally is housing to meet the needs of local people, there are key issues to address, young people can not get onto the housing ladder and have to resort to renting that can cost more than mortgage payments and there is an ageing population that require housing to meet their needs. What I would expect the planning department to complete before any development plans are signed off is a thorough research project to identify what is actually required locally, what is affordable to the local community and what the mix of starter homes, shared ownership and social rent homes should be. The Housing and Planning Bill has recently been passed and this includes the development of starter homes for first time buyers as part of the affordable housing requirement. These	meet. • See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt. • Property values are not considered material in planning law. • See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites including mills. • See response to PO1109 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • It is agreed that affordable housing is needed locally. All sites will be required to provide a percentage of affordable housing / starter homes so will contribute to this need. The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment provides housing evidence. • See response to PO4844 regarding highways. • Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). • Elected members decide on the content of the Local Plan not Council Officers. The plan also undergoes independent examination to allow objectors to have their say in front of an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							homes can be for sale up to £250,000 outside of London. Local salaries of young first time buyers would not make these affordable, SMDC must ensure that affordable homes to purchase are for sale at a price that local people can afford. The type of houses that are required should also be researched, surely the requirement is for smaller affordable homes, 1 bed apartments for singles and couples and older people to downsize to and then 2 and 3 bed homes for young families. I also made a freedom of information request to the district council with regard to the recent development at Uplands Mill in Biddulph asking for the breakdown of owner occupation, shared ownership and social housing and how many nominations had been made for local people to the social landlord, unfortunately this has not been provided in time for me to include this within this response. The reason I made this request was to be able to identify if there was a need for social housing in Biddulph or if the housing association had to widen its search for tenants to the north west, which I believe to be the case. please consider these alternative sites, maintain Biddulph as a rural town, protect the green belt and the interests of longstanding local residents. In addition I support the development of previous Brownfield sites at Victoria Colliery and land behind Bemersley Recycle Centre off Childerplay Road. I believe that these sites should be considered before building properties around the existing properties that benefit from being alongside Green Belt. These residents are your current council tax payers and their interests should be taken into consideration. Schools - although there is a proposed new first school, is there adequate space for these pupils to move into the middle school or will this mean they will just mean larger class sizes that will be detrimental to and affect the education standards. Green Belt review – the land beyond Pennine Way was deemed as inappropriate as it would diminish the boundary between the Biddulph and Biddulph Moor, however building on this site shall have much more of an impact on the boundary of Gillow Heath. I believe that the elected members of Biddulph should make their own decision on what land should be allocated for having and not the council officers and certainly not the developers who are looking for the best land to maximise on their profit.	
PO929 PO925	Mr Robert Stockley Mrs Elaine Stockley				Green Belt	Object	Green Belt: Our government has pledged in its manifesto that Green Belt areas are safe for the next five years. A key commitment in the Conservative manifesto is to prioritise Brownfield development. Key principles of Green Belt designation are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of the area, to carry	• See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt including any exceptional circumstances • The BVW is a very significant attribute in the town and part of a national Sustrans cycle route. Therefore any development in the area would be built around it. The route is generally buffered by trees and hedgerows. All new development bordering the route would be required

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							out urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. According to the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England “Green belts are a buffer between town and countryside. Within their boundaries, damaged and derelict land can be improved and nature conservation is encouraged. Green Belts help with food production, help us tackle the huge challenges of climate change, form part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing places for people and for nature long into the future. Neighbourhood plans: Under the Government’s pledges, local people are to have more control over the planning of their neighbourhoods and the protection of Green Belt areas. The development of Neighbourhood Plans is there to give more power to local allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their area and that local people should have the final say on developments in their town. Our objections: According to the “Local Development Framework” document, sustainable development means “A better quality of life for everybody now and in the future”. Why do we need all these extra houses in Biddulph, when there are so many empty properties in the town. These extra houses will put great pressure on the infrastructure - Medical centres, the sewerage system (already overloaded from current residents and the many visitors to Biddulph Grange Gardens, the Country Park, Biddulph Valley Way, Sports facilities, town centre etc..) and the quality of life for residents through increased congestion and pollution. We are astounded that you are considering a plan for houses and a school on the Green Belt land around Akemore Lane. We have been told that this Green Belt land has been a last minute amendment to the plan, which suggests that you are attempting to deceive people and go against all the principles of Neighbourhood planning. What are the reasons for adding Akemore Lane to the plan, Biddulph is known as the Garden town of Staffordshire and yet you are willing to deprive local people and visitors of the beautiful countryside on the boundary of the town, which many people enjoy along the Biddulph Valley Way. You are prepared to disturb the wonderful bird/animal life and nature, which is in abundance there. Has an independent ecological survey been undertaken for this site to show the projected effect of water courses, will life (ironically Akemore Lane has breeding curlews and lapwings (curlews being the bird shown on the SMDC logo!!) If you check old Ordinance Survey maps, you will see that this area used to be called “Lapwing fields”. You are prepared to locate housing and a school next to the White Cottage, a very rare example of a Staffordshire thatched dwelling and Grade 1 listed. We have been informed at a recent resident’s meeting that Staffordshire Moorlands District Offices are ignoring objections and ideas from our local	to provide pedestrian and cycle links on to it. The Council has produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy and the BVW is identified within this document. It is not considered that development in this location would impact on the enjoyment of the route and long ranging views (e.g. to Mow Cop) and the wider countryside would remain. • See response to PO4844 in relation to highways • Ecological assessments of all sites have been undertaken by the Council to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. • See response to PO1109 in relation to Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Lane. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district’s full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • Need for additional housing stems from a number of factors, for example household formation, in-migration, linkages with future workforce, and other factors. The NPPF makes clear that housing projections are the starting point for assessing housing needs; however these additional factors should also be taken in to account in Council SHMAs. The Council’s own housing need assessments are set out in its evidence base on the website. Note that this already takes into consideration empty properties in the Moorlands. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Biddulph councillors and riding rough-shod over local people's wishes, going against all the principles of Neighbourhood plans. We are also very concerned that objections raised to the plan have so far not been uploaded to the relevant website - is this a ruse on your part to discourage people from making their objections, as well as making the website extremely difficult to locate from the main SMDC site? We believe that the Green Belt area proposed is unsuitable for building purposes, due to the many drift mines and the level of flooding over the last few years. Has there been a technical survey of flooding control in this area? There are extensive Brownfield sites in Biddulph and empty properties, which could be used rather than encroaching onto the Green Belt areas of the town. For example, the Victoria Colliery site has had millions spent on it (presumably from residents' council tax/income tax), so that it could be developed, so surely this would be an ideal option, meeting the government's commitment to prioritise Brownfield development and the aims of Neighbourhood planning. Another Brownfield site might be the Childerplay area, as well as other sites in the town, such as Whally Street, Singer Street, Cross Street, the ground behind the Leisure Centre (for the school), Caravan storage area, behind Chell's Yard. If we are not vigilant, we will be allowing our generation to spoil these Green Belt areas for generations to come. It is a terrible plan, badly presented, unscrutinised and rushed through - please stop now and think what you are doing. Above all, please listen to local people and adhere to the principles of Neighbourhood plans and the Government's commitment to Green Belt areas.	opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations nor is the possibility of noise from the school or parking issues. - The Local Plan production process, by its very nature, involves several stages of consultation at which point anyone can suggest further sites for inclusion in the plan and the Council decides on whether they are appropriate. This site was suggested as part of the site options consultation. - Heritage impact assessments of all sites have been undertaken by the Council to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. - The comments made online on the Council's consultation portal will all be uploaded for public viewing at the same time. - There was a link to the consultation portal from the SMDC website homepage throughout the consultation. - Coal Authority records of all sites have been viewed by the Council to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. - Flood plain and drainage information of all sites has been provided by statutory consultees (the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Officer) to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. - See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. All sites listed have been investigated and those which are available have been included in the plan.
PO10242	Mr R Hart				Green Belt	Object	The green belt should be protected for the future generations to enjoy. Even David Cameron [and Sybil Ralphs] said it should be protected.	See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6598	Councillor H Sheldon				Green Belt	Object	I wish to inform you of my objection to the use of green belt land for housing in Biddulph. I believe the number of houses proposed is too high as they are unsustainable due to lack of both existing and proposed employment land. This increases travel to work for residents and impacts greatly on the environment in respect of carbon emissions. The building of housing in Biddulph should be prioritised to Brownfield sites which can be compulsory purchased to provide the land necessary, e.g. former mill sites. Developing these sites would regenerate the Town and improve the ascetic look of the area. The needs of the existing community are not currently met with a deficit of open public space and children's play areas. Faculties for young people are also in short supply there are few youth clubs or organised support. Medical facilities i.e. doctors lists are over subscribed. This also applies to education with school places in short supply. There is a lack of retail facilities in the town with one supermarket meaning most resident have to travel to source necessities which are unavailable locally. The transport infrastructure is inadequate currently and increased housing will exacerbate this issue. Public transport to the north finishes at 6.00pm leaving workers reliant on their own transport or taxis, public transport to Biddulph Moor ceases at 5.00pm stranding workers and children staying for after school clubs. Biddulph's essential character would be compromised if new housing is built on Greenfield space, it is preferable to develop unsightly Brownfield sites and provide these developments with the infrastructure and services needed to thrive.	• See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • New employment areas are also proposed for Biddulph in the draft Local Plan. • See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • The Council has commissioned a new open space study to update the position on which areas have a surplus and deficit of open space and children's play areas. This will inform the Local Plan and has been published alongside the latest draft of the Local Plan. • See response to PO929 regarding infrastructure including medical facilities. • The Council's Retail Study (published in 2013) recommends that the Council allocate a site to accommodate a discount foodstore to provide more choice for local shoppers as currently Sainsburys is the only large supermarket in the town. Evidence suggests that a high proportion of Biddulph residents still shop out of town for their main food shop and it is considered that a greater choice of supermarkets would help to reverse this trend. • Public transport services are the responsibility of the County Council and provision of them is outside the remit of the Local Plan.
PO6745	Mr Stephen Dobbs				Green Belt	Object	I have lived in and around biddulph all of my life and in my 51 years I have seen considerable development in the Biddulph valley. I am convinced that the council and developers will not rest until they have completely built on every scrap of greenery in the valley. I absolutely object to any development on green belt land and especially the new proposed site on Akesmore Lane which has recently been added. I believe any such development on green belt land is just the thin end of the wedge and once begun it will pave the way to complete development of all the green belt in the valley. Development of Greenbelt land will reduce the quality of life for everyone who lives in Biddulph apart from the developers, speculators and others looking to profit from the development. I also consider that there is absolutely no need for any further housing in the local area. The councils and governments major concern should	• See response to PO692 regarding loss of Green Belt • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. Staffordshire County Council are the Education Authority and they look at the need for new schools in an area as a result of development. They consider that a new first school would be needed in Biddulph to accommodate the level of new housing development currently proposed. The location of this school would not be decided until the Council has

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							be the development of a stable population size, not uncontrolled and unsustainable and irresponsible;e population growth and that policies should be adopted which encourage this. If housing is required as a result of councils / government being unable to control population then they should firstly look at bringing second homes and holiday homes back into the mainstream housing market and then as a last resort development of brownfield sites. Biddulph should not be allowed to become one huge estate providing cheap housing for Cheshire and Staffordshire commuters. The charm and uniqueness of the town should not be further denegated and since I am sure there are considerable sums of money to be made by the further development of the town, the developers, speculators, vultures and others seeking to gain should not be allowed to profit and reduce the quality of life for Biddulph residents. In addition to my above objections I must also point out that Biddulph does not have the transport infrastructure to cope with any further development. The roads out of Biddulph via Mow Lane (until recently) and Akesmore Lane have been allowed to lapse into a terrible state of repair with a considerable number of potholes which rendered Akesmore Lane almost impassible in a car. If the council is unable to maintain roads with the current number of vehicles then I dread to thinjk what things would be like with even more vehicles on the roads as a result of building more houses. Also the only road out of Biddulph leading direct to the potteries is often congested especially around Knypersley traffic lights and now increasingly by the site of the business development which has taken place on the Knypersley Vics site. I dont believe any Biddulph residents would welcome further increases in their journey times to get to the potteries or to travel in any other direction out of Biddulph but this is precisely what will happen if there is any further housing development. I trust these comments and objections will be taken on board before the council decides to continue with the proposed plans and I look forward to receiving any comments you may have.	firmed up its plans as to where the new housing development will take place in the town. (There are 2 options put forward as potential locations for a new school in the Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation booklet). • See response to PO692 regarding using brown field land first (including mills) • See response to PO929 regarding Impact on BVW / Visual impact • See response to PO929 regarding residential amenity - disturbance from building work / noise from school / parking during school drop-off and pick-up times • See response to PO4844 regarding highways

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6274	Mr P Squires				Green Belt	Object	As a resident for 52 years in Biddulph North you have to respect why Green Belt areas have been put into place. There is a good reason it's unspoilt and provides stability, I see this land every day the wildlife corridor that runs along the return of the wild ducks Canadian geese recent years have seen the buzzards return so why would you want to destroy Biddulph North with new build out of character unneeded housing. Do you not realise that the houses in the area (Green Belt) are on septic tanks and the field is the runoff area. BD087 Green belt is also the nearest flood plain field to the brook also for a good reason. It's a farmer's field through June, July, Aug and Sept, it has cows grazing question. Why haven't any houses been built on the Old Forge Colour works isn't it time that land has been available. Can our town cater for what you propose? The schools are full. First you have to provide the necessary High and extend primary schools. Why not look at regenerating Brindley Ford new school for housing. Don't destroy our town or you will lose the very people who use it most green belt land BD087 is listed as fairly low risk flood plain it is currently an important site for the water run off directly into the brook. With Congleton edge high ground directly opposite its natural route to end the water run-off.	• See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt. • Ecological assessments of all sites have been undertaken by the Council to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. • Flood plain and drainage information of all sites has been provided by statutory consultees (the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Officer) to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. • Please see the table for Question 19 BD087 for site specific responses. • The Forge Colour Works has planning permission for housing already and has been included within Biddulph's housing figures. • See response to PO929 in relation to infrastructure (including medical and schools). • See response to PO752 in relation to building outside the District (Brindley Ford).
PO6269	Mrs S Bennett				Green Belt	Object	Green belt should remain Green Belt Road Structure inadequate Road safety compromised	• See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO4844 regarding highways.
PO6752	Mrs J Sailes				Green Belt	Object	Green Belt should remain unless exceptional circumstances exist and no other viable options apply this clearly not the case in this instance? There are no very exceptional circumstances to warrant inclusion into Green Belt, therefore alternative sites should be considered as they do exist.	• See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • See response to PO1109 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development.
PO9961	Miss M Underwood				Green Belt	Object	It is unacceptable to build on Green Belt sites when there are so many brownfield sites that could be used. The Green Belt is vital for biodiversity. Connectivity of natural areas is needed for wildlife to survive and bring essential ecosystem services to us all. Biddulph does not need this many new properties. Once Uplands Mill is completed it will be clear how difficult it will be to sell properties hemmed in on every side with no greenery. There are 44 units of affordable housing already on Uplands Mill. I do not believe that these will be allocated to young people from the Biddulph area which will result in allocations being made to people from outside the area. This will not help Biddulph at all due to high turnover due to rented properties being continually vacant as new tenants leave due to them wanting to move back to areas they are from. The roads into Biddulph from Chell and Congleton are terrible and cannot support the current volume of traffic. All the roads need resurfacing as they are crumbling under the weight of all the cars. All the new properties will be allocated or sold to people out of the Biddulph area (as there is not sufficient demand	• See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt. • See response to PO692 in relation to use of brownfield sites – including mills. • See response to PO1109 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development. • Ecological assessments of all sites have been undertaken by the Council to assist in determining the most appropriate areas for development. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • See response to PO4844 regarding highways.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							within the town itself) which means that the 1600+ cars that will be in Biddulph due to the 800 new properties will all go out of the town daily to work elsewhere. This will cause more damage to the roads but will not bring any more income or wages into Biddulph as people will spend them mainly in the area where they work.	
PO7574	Mr Peter Turner				Green Belt	Object	Relating to ALL Green Belt incursion proposals, SMDC has arbitrarily (i.e. not based on evidence of need, demand, and availability of developable land outside of the Green Belt) set local development targets based on a percentage allocation scheme. This mechanism does not recognise the intended permanence of Green Belt as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Nor does this method withstand the tests for allowing development in the Green Belt thereby not demonstrating exceptional circumstances. On this basis the inclusion of Green Belt within the Local Plan will be challenged. It is also known that SMDC has identified developable land outside the Green Belt elsewhere within Staffordshire Moorlands, which, as directed by the NPPF, must be prioritised to be developed prior to removing any land from the Green Belt. On this basis the SMDC Green Belt review will be challenged. Developing Green Belt within Biddulph will add to urban sprawl, which is a key motive of protection of the Green Belt within the NPPF. The detail of this submission will be shared with elected members and the media. It is noted within the NPPF Paragraph 79 - SMDC failure to recognise permanence, openness or risk of urban sprawl The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 80 - SMDC failure to protect against urban sprawl, to protect countryside against encroachment, in urban regeneration as other sites demonstrated as developable within the borough. Green Belt serves five purposes: ● to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; ● to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; ● to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; ● to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and ● to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 81 - SMDC failing to plan positively to enhance positive use of Green Belt, retain and enhance amenity and biodiversity, also failing to improve damaged or derelict land. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity;	• The Council's Green Belt Review acts as its evidence base for changes to the Green Belt in the Staffordshire Moorlands. • The 20% figure – Biddulph's share of the District housing requirement - is set out in the Council's Core Strategy, a planning document which has been through consultation and an examination by an independent inspector.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							or to improve damaged and derelict land. Paragraph 83 - SMDC failure to demonstrate exceptional circumstances as other sites available in the borough outside of the Green Belt. Arbitrary approach to percentage allocation will be challenged. Failure to recognise the intended permanence of Green Belt. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Paragraph 84 - SMDC to channel development within draft Local Plan to urban areas or areas outwith the Green Belt. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 87 - SMDC failure to demonstrate very special circumstances as land outside the green belt available for development elsewhere within SMDC area. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 - SMDC failure to demonstrate very special circumstances as previously outlined. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 89 - SMDC have not demonstrated or evidenced any of the requirements as detailed in this paragraph. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: • buildings for agriculture and forestry; Achieving sustainable development 21 • provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it • the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building • the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							than the one it replaces • limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or • limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Paragraph 90 - SMDC have not demonstrated or evidenced any of the requirements as detailed in this paragraph. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are: • mineral extraction; • engineering operations; • local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location; • the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and • development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order. Inclusion of the green Belt will be challenged on all of the above NPPF Paragraphs.	
PO5249	Kyoko Boll				BD134 BD110 BD067 BD067 a BD067 b BD067 c	Object	While I am living in the area, on the site of BD134, according to the latest proposed sites as far as I saw, the BD134 has been disappeared. However, I have not received any nor heard any confirmation what site plans of housing development at these allocated sites. Where sites BD067a, BD037b, BD067c were abandoned and that any houses in areas will not be built or developed. I would like to propose again that I strongly object to the plan of housing developments in these areas. I mentioned above in the future. I object to the plan to build houses at the areas BD134, BD110, BD067, BD067a, BD067b, BD067c.	Comments noted.
PO10246	Mr R Hart				BD067 a -c	Object	Comments on proposed housing allocation in biddulph...i feel that sites bd067a/b/c should have reduced housing allocation.	No housing allocation is included in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries Document (April 2016) for these sites.
PO4860	Mr Chris Millington				BD067 a, b, c, BD110 BD134	Object	BD067a, b, c, BD110 BD134 are too close to the Biddulph Moor Boundary and therefore need to remain in the Green Belt.	No housing allocation is included in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries Document (April 2016) for these sites.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on Green Belt)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO327	Frank Cottrell				Green Belt	Support	Over the recent years Biddulph north has had 90% of the new build in Biddulph. By building on the Victoria Colliery site and Childerplay Road site it would stop urban creep onto Biddulph Moor and have easy access to major routes by being closer to the A527., Biddulph north at school times is very congested with traffic and quite dangerous. LET US KEEP BIDDULPH GREEN - NO BUILDING ON GREEN BELT	See response to PO1109 regarding Victoria Colliery and Childerplay as alternative locations for development.
PO10215	Mrs Julia Hackney				Green Belt	Support	Biddulph prides itself as a semi rural location situated just outside Peak District. Can be seen from mow Cop and Biddulph Moor. It seems a shame that more buildings have to be considered to take up yet more green belt spaces. Town centre needs to keep up with ongoing town expansion. I currently commute out of town. I was disappointed that artisan market was only on a Friday 9.00-3.00. Unfortunately a lot of [working] people cannot attend this market.	- See response to PO692 in relation to loss of Green Belt. - Markets are outside the remit of the local plan.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on sites within Development Boundary)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4601	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD004	Support	BD004 - Brownfield site needs to be considered but concerns over traffic access, recommended for inclusion.	This site has previously been considered for inclusion as an allocation. However, there is a significant access issue as County Highways has advised that “access off City Bank requires visibility over third party land. There can be no intensification of use of this access without a visibility improvement”. The other significant issue is that the intentions of the landowner are unknown. Part of the site is unregistered and the owner of the part that is registered has been contacted several times but not responded to any correspondence. The Council has to prove to a Government Inspector that any sites included in the plan are available and deliverable and these issues create significant uncertainty. The site could still come forward at a later date as it is not within the Green Belt.
PO10230	Mr Graeme Court				BD004	Support	Suggest alternative site BD004 - City Bank Gillow Heath. A small brown field site which was originally proposed for development.	See response to PO4601.
PO10179 PO10160 PO10001	Mr A Hague Mr N Clowes Mr Ray Lloyd				BD004	Support	Support BD004 (City Bank Mill).	See response to PO4601.
PO10012 PO9988	Mrs C Cliffe Mr D Cliffe				BD004	Support	Support the non-inclusion of BD004 in the plan.	Comment noted.
PO5011 PO5027 PO4908 PO10171 PO10185 PO10147	Mr R Milner Mr F Moorhouse Mr B Barcoft Mr Robert Chambers Rev Lindsay Clowes Mrs B Rowland				BD004	Object	Object	See response to PO4601.
PO10287	Mr G Boulton				BD004	Object	City Bank Mill i object to this site.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on sites within Development Boundary)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10141 PO10103 PO10070 PO10240 PO10129 PO9657 PO10090	Mrs Anne Young Mr & Mrs S & C Fielding G B Ford Mrs Angela Turner Mr R Meadowcroft Mr and Mrs A D Lawton Mrs Claire Meadowcroft				BD004 & BD102	Object	Object to the exclusion of BD004 (City Bank Mill) and BD102 (Minster Mill) from the plan.	See response to PO4601 regarding City Bank Mill. Minster Mill is potentially suitable for a housing allocation in the Local Plan.
PO7581	Mr Peter Turner				BD004 / BD102	Object	Object to exclusion of sites from plan. BD004, BD102 - These sites offer far more appropriate development opportunities, away from the water treatment works and meeting highways requirements.	See response to PO4601 regarding City Bank Mill. See response to PO10141 regarding BD102.
PO10231	Mr Graeme Court				BD016	Support	Suggest alternative site BD016 - Disused garage at the corner of Tunstall Road and Walley Street. Another brownfield site, virtually in the town centre.	BD016 is already included in the Preferred Options plan as a housing allocation.
PO5010	Mr R Milner				BD055	Support	BD055	Noted. This site is already included in the Preferred Options plan as a housing allocation.
PO10144	Mrs B Rowland				BD055	Object	Object to site BD055	Comment noted.
PO4604	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD059	Object	BD059 – some traffic concerns, recommended for inclusion.	The landowners current intentions regarding this land are unknown as he has moved from the address on Land Registry records and so cannot be contacted. The Council has to prove to a Government Inspector that any sites included in the plan are available and deliverable and this issue creates significant uncertainty. The site could still come forward at a later date as it is not within the Green Belt.
PO10232	Mr Graeme Court				BD059	Support	Suggest alternative site BD059 - Joiners Yard, Shepherd Street. A brownfield site.	See response to PO4604.
PO5257	Mr and Mrs J B Ecclestone				BD071	Support	Filling out the west side of the bypass seems more sensible options. The bypass itself is beneficial to the development on the west.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on sites within Development Boundary)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO378	Mr Peter Turner				BD071 & BD071A BD106 & BD156 BD055 BD016 BD108 BD004 BD102 BD063A BD069 ADD04 ADD03 BD117	Support	Support development away from the sewage works on sites with appropriate highways access such as: BD071 & BD071A BD106 & BD156 BD055 BD016 BD108 BD004 BD102 BD063A BD069 ADD04 ADD03 BD117	Comment noted.
PO2783	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			BD101	General comment	BD101 appears to be brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	Comments noted.
PO4605	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD101	Object	BD101 - Brownfield Site part of the proposed mill triangle, recommended for inclusion.	Yarn Mill is potentially suitable for a housing allocation in the Local Plan.
PO10233	Mr Graeme Court				BD101 / BD102	Object	Suggest alternative site BD101 and BD102 - the so called mills triangle. Another brownfield site, very close to the town centre.	See response to PO10141 regarding Minster Mill. See response to PO4605 regarding Yarn Mill.
PO10288	Mr G Boulton				BD101 / BD102	Object	i support Minster Mill and Whalley Street.	Comment noted.
PO2785	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			BD102	General comment	BD102 appears to be brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	Comments noted.
PO4873 PO5012 PO10002 PO10172	Mr Allan Knapper Mr R Milner Mr Ray Lloyd Mr Robert Chambers				BD102	Object	Object to exclusion of site.	Comment noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Comments on sites within Development Boundary)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/ Object/ General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10011 PO9986 PO10115 PO10161 PO10148 PO10180 PO10186 PO4909	Mrs C Cliffe Mr D Cliffe Mrs V Whiston Mr N Clowes Mrs B Rowland Mr A Hague Rev Lindsay Clowes Mr B Barcoft							
PO4606	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BD102	Object	BD102 - Brownfield site part of the proposed mill triangle, recommended for inclusion.	See response to PO10141 regarding Minster Mill.
PO10234	Mr Graeme Court				BD108	Support	Suggest alternative site BD108 - The old Jacksons Nursery. Another brown field site.	This site is already included in the Preferred Options plan as a housing allocation.
PO2786	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			BD109	General comment	BD109 appears to be brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	Comments noted.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4620	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			ADD02	Object	ADD02 - This site has been recommended via the last consultation and should be further investigated. Recommendation TBD.	Land at Brindley Ford – This land is outside the Staffordshire Moorlands within Newcastle Borough. Newcastle Borough Council has been asked whether they would consider development on the old minerals sites within their boundary to meet Staffordshire Moorlands housing requirements. The feedback received in response to this has been negative. Also, circumstances have changed since last year and it is considered that the District can meet its own development needs without using land outside its boundary.
PO7364	Mr John Hayley				Green Belt / Other Suggested Sites	Support	I support the use of reclaimed land and brown field land for housing (NPPF paragraph 111). I also strongly support the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) planning strategy of “brownfield first, greenfield last” and hence wish to discourage inappropriate use of greenfield land in and around Biddulph. I am opposed to greenfield development for housing within the Green Belt. I am also deeply opposed to proposed developments such as Sites ADD03, ADD04 & BD063a which would require inappropriate changes to Green Belt boundaries and which would cause extensive encroachment into Biddulph’s surrounding beautiful open countryside. However, I would support housing development and housing site allocation at the following sites: - [BD101, BD102] A strategic redevelopment of the town centre near to the war memorial in the region known as “mill triangle” bounded by the A527, Walley Street, Cross Street, and Congleton Road. This could and should be a high density housing development because of its proximity to the town centre. A well planned and well designed development at this location could provide significant enhancement to Biddulph’s prosperity and to Biddulph’s town centre. - Redevelopment of the former Albion Mill, a disused 3-storey building in Station Road - Re-designation of “green belt” status of reclaimed land to the west of Victoria Business Park (part of the former colliery site, Victoria Colliery). Redevelopment of this site for potential housing allocation. - Redevelopment and new development on brown field land in the vicinity of Childerplay Lane - Relocation of some land for employment use from Site BD117 to Childerplay Lane (potentially to enable increased housing allocation to be located at Site BB117) - [ADD02] Redevelopment of Site ADD02 (near to Brindley Ford) for productive use, including potential use for housing. [I strongly disagree that this land requires green belt protection and with the assertion that this land makes a “significant contribution to green belt purposes”]. I would also support any proposal that the SMDC planning department should do a full feasibility study concerning use of reclaimed open casting land and land forming part of the former Victoria Colliery to the west of Victoria Business Park.	Minster Mill and Yarn Mill are recommended as allocations in the next stage of the Local Plan (subject to outcome of Council Assembly). Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. Albion Mill is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall. Biddulph Town Council’s Masterplan is considering this area and this could assist in bringing the site forward. There is clearly developer interest as this is reflected in the planning history. Former Victoria Colliery Land – Although the Green Belt Review recommends that this land could be released if exceptional circumstances were demonstrated and the landowner is willing to release the land for development, there are other factors to consider. The site is located on the southern edge of the town some distance from the town centre and is not recommended for taking forward into the Preferred Options Local Plan due to: An alternative Green Belt site exists adjacent to Wharf Road which will assist with bringing forward a large strategic mixed use regeneration site which is well related to the town centre and its key services and facilities. Land at Childerplay Lane (old Council tip site), Land East of Childerplay Road and Former Quarry off Tunstall Road / Bemersley Road – The Green Belt Review does not recommend releasing these areas of land from the Green Belt. Relocating employment land from BD117 to Childerplay Lane to accommodate more housing – This is not recommended for the reasons above – the sites are not recommended for release from the Green Belt. The

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								employment land is needed to meet the needs of the town over the plan period and it is considered that BD117 is the best location to accommodate this need. See response to PO4620 re: land at Brindley Ford.
PO279	Mrs Judith Cottrell				Other Suggested Sites	Support	There are two sites in the south of the Biddulph area which would be suitable for new housing, one being the old Victoria Colliery site which has been treated and cleared for housing and also the Childerplay Road site, which again is suitable for housing purposes.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO1084	Mr and Mrs C.B. Dodds				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Build houses on Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road sites	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO1028 2	Cllr Chris Wood				Other Suggested Sites	Object	I have suggested the old Victoria colliery site which I believe would accommodate a large number of the housing requirements and not cause distress in terms of incursion into the green belt most of the collieries in North Staffordshire have been built on for housing so why not Victoria colliery it would enhance the area and have good access to the A 527. Also the site at Childerplay Lane which is reclaimed land should be bought into use for either housing or commercial use , I do strongly object to incursions into green belt but also understand the need for a 5 year housing plan but the sites put forward are illogical and ill thought out.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO500	Mr Denver Johnson				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Alternative sites - there is a huge area of reclaimed land from the old Victoria colliery at the South West end of Biddulph with easy access from the A527 and simple integration into the rest of the area. Over the road from there, is another former industrial site (formerly an old steel mill) South East of Biddulph off Childerplay Road with equally excellent access and good views. The old Bemersley Road council tip site also adjoining Childerplay Road is due for closure since it's operations are to be moved to a new Chatterley-Whitfield site, would be open for future development.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO956	Mr Alistair McLoughlin				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	BD004 (15 dwellings) Brownfield Development Within residential boundary Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion. Biddulph Town Council supports. Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk. BD101 (24 dwellings) Brownfield Development Within residential boundary Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Biddulph Town Council supports Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk. BD102 (42 dwellings) Brownfield Development Within residential boundary Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Provides similar number of units developed without environmental and highways impacts Biddulph Town Council supports. Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works,	BD004 is inside the town development boundary but there are highway and ownership constraints. Access is off City Bank and requires visibility over third party land. There can be no intensification of use of this access without a visibility improvement. There is no certainty over the land owner – a large part of the site is unregistered and the part that is registered, the owner has not made contact with the Council despite being sent several communications. Although for these reasons, this site is not recommended as an allocation, as it is not in the green belt it could still come forward if the

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							therefore less of a public health risk. BD064 (12 dwellings) Biodiversity value low Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Provides similar number of units developed without environmental and highways impacts Biddulph Town Council supports. Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk. Chell's Builders' Merchant (15 dwellings) Brownfield Development Within residential boundary Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Biddulph Town Council supports. Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk. Land opposite Briarswood (currently designated Visual Open Space) (25 dwellings) Brownfield Development Within residential boundary Land owner believed to be supportive of inclusion Biddulph Town Council supports. Not proximate to the sewerage treatment works, therefore less of a public health risk.	constraints could be overcome. Chells Builders Merchants Land - Landowner won't release land for development. Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation. Refer to PO7364 (above) re: mills. BD064 - Included at Site Options Stage but not included at Preferred Options Stage because not recommended for release from Green Belt in Green Belt Review. Land opposite Briarswood - This particular site is not considered suitable for a Local Green Space designation as it does not meet the criteria so there is an opportunity to consider it as a development site. However, the landowner is unwilling to release the land for development. Without owner support the land cannot be taken forward as an allocation.
PO4882	Mr Allan Knapper				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	Former Victoria Colliery site, site left of Childerplay Road. Derelict mill on Station Road.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO5115	Mr Cottrell				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Over the recent years Biddulph North has had a 90% of the new build in Biddulph by building on the new Victoria colliery site and Childerplay Road it would stop urban creep onto Biddulph Moor, and have easy access to a major route by being closer to the A527 road. Biddulph North at school times is very congested with traffic and quite dangerous let us try to keep Biddulph Green and no building on Green Belt.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO4611	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Gas Works Station Road - Land up for sale for development, recommended for inclusion.	Gas Works - Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall.
PO4612	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Dye Works, Congleton Road - Plans passed. This land lies within the designated BNP area, recommended for inclusion.	Forge Works - This site has a live planning permission and developers are working to implement it so a Local Plan allocation is considered unnecessary.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4621	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Site adjacent to Victoria Business Park - This site has been recommended by Cllr Wood and should be investigated. At recent public meeting this site was met with approval. Recommendation TBD.	Refer to PO7364 (above).
PO4623 PO1022 9	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Mr Graeme Court	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Chell's Builders' Yard and land down to bypass roundabout. This site needs investigation in conjunction with the Mill triangle. Recommendation for inclusion.	Refer to PO956 and PO7364.
PO4624	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Land adjacent 71/71a, Woodside Farm - Land available, next to proposed acceptable site, close to town centre, easy access via already proposed site. No neighbouring property. Needs investigation and consultation. Recommendation TBD.	East of Woodside Farm - The Council has investigated this area. It is considered suitable for release from the Green Belt if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Appropriate access could be achieved according to the Highway Authority. Investigations so far have concluded that an access across the Biddulph Valley Way would be desirable and no utilities constraints have come to light at the time of writing. Therefore, this site has been recommended for inclusion in the Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Options Local Plan (subject to outcome of Council Assembly).
PO4625	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Newpool Rd Caravan site – Brown field, why not? Recommendation TBD.	Newpool Road Caravan Site - Although this site is considered suitable for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances, it is difficult to justify exceptional circumstances for release from Green Belt of such a small site. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.
PO4626	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	Brown Lees Chapel - Site for 4 dwellings either within existing building or new builds. Recommendation TBD.	Brown Lees Chapel - Too small for an allocation. Could come forward independently from the plan as it is within the development boundary.
PO4627	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	BD109/118/ Land off Brook St - Alternative to BD063a? Recommendation TBD.	Land off Brook Street - This area was included in the Site Options Consultation. However, it was then assessed as part of the Green Belt Review and not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO4628	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Other Suggested Sites	Object	BD144 West of Towerhill Road - Possible alternative to BD063a? Recommendation TBD.	Land off Towerhill Road - This area was included in the Site Options Consultation. However, it was then assessed as part of the Green Belt Review and not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4970	Mrs R Knapper				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Suggested sites the old Victoria colliery, Childerplay Road, derelict Mill Station Road	Refer to PO956 and PO7364.
PO4969	Mr R Booth				Other Suggested Sites	Object	I just cannot understand why the SMDC are proposing to build new developments in Biddulph on Green Belt land when there are derelict areas in the Town that are being overlooked. Buildings and factories which have been left to decay and are very unsightly after years of neglect I propose that these areas should be seriously taken into account and considered for the new build and derelict sites as they are is common sense? The sites that I propose in place of the proposed Green Belt sites are: Station Road area/Cross Street, Stringer Street, Whalley Street, The old Victoria Colliery Site.	Refer to PO7364.
PO4968	Mrs M Booth				Other Suggested Sites	Object	When considering the new development for the enhancement for the new builds in Biddulph. I SMDC to firstly consider the areas of Brownfield Sites. The derelict site that houses a disused factory in Station Road. The derelict factory in Cross Street which is the old Standards Factory (this would be ideal for Aldi or Lidl supermarket which would keep the towns community shopping within the High Street. A huge housing development could be proposed on the old Victoria Colliery site which would enhance the entrance into the entrance to the moorlands which I am sure that the council will agree should be upheld. No one is objecting to this new development but we must protect out valley are surrounding but we must protect our valley and surrounding areas, protecting our wildlife as well.	Refer to PO7364.
PO5358	Mr D Heath				Other Suggested Sites	Support	Building to the west side also closer to the Chatterley Whitfield site understood to create 2100 jobs. Being able to walk via the railway line.	Refer to PO4624.
PO5724	Mrs Eileen Smith				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Feel that the available Brown Field site should be seriously looked at as building sites, including Old Mills that are practically derelict and Victoria Colliery land, and Childerplay Road area – and similar. Also attached letter dated 9/9/2015 addressed to Mr D Plant which illustrates the problems that are inherent on the, and the approach (and lack of safety etc.) surrounding this particular area.	Refer to PO7364.
PO5825	Mr Christopher Slater				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	Objection's 1 to 4 houses should be built on Victoria Colliery + Childerplay Road sites	Refer to PO7364.
PO5981	Mr P Price				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Being a Brownfield Site Victoria Colliery should be considered as should all the Brownfield sites before Green Belt is even considered. Why do we need so many houses when we have so many unoccupied in this area? I don't trust the figures.	Refer to PO7364.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5993	Mrs L Price				Other Suggested Sites	Object	While I no objection to the principle of extra housing in the Biddulph Valley. I do strongly object to Green Belt being used before all brown sites have been developed e.g.: The Victoria Colliery Site, Jackson Garden Nursery, Minster Mill, Whalley Street etc. The recent developed Selectus Site still has so many unsold properties so will other large developments be the same. There have been so many contrary figures are produced by various parties is it all misinformation? Who does one trust?	Refer to PO7364. Former Jackson's Nursery is already included as a Local Plan allocation.
PO6756 PO6257 PO6498 PO6755 PO6478 PO6261 PO6271 PO6775 PO6776 PO6771 PO6258 PO6206 PO6512	Ms Barbara Griffiths R Hutton Mr K Wilshaw Mr C Kirkham Mr Gilbert Bradley Mr B.W. Newton Mrs J M Slater Mr J Banister Mrs J Banister Mr R Bradbury Mr G Price Mrs P Newton Mr S Wilshaw				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Build houses on Victoria Colliery and Childerplay Road sites objections 1-4	Refer to PO7364.
PO6270	Mr A Hague				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	To protect Green Belt potential development could include the mills close to the town centre, the old Victoria Colliery and the lad off Childerplay Road anyone with a brain larger than a field mouse would not build houses on site BD068, this is just another trick to get more social housing by the government and tory council as the old Selectus site. I own 3 properties in Marsh Green Road and would not agree to any land fronting Marsh Green Road being taken for developments.	Refer to PO7364. Refer to Question 19 site table BD068.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7383	Mr Nigel Yates				Other Suggested Sites	Support	Support the alternative sites for housing which are listed below: A012 - redundant and under-utilised buildings around Congleton Rd/Cross St/ Stringer St/ Walley St and Station Rd. (photograph attached) This is a brownfield urban site which requires regeneration and redevelopment, existing businesses could be re-located within a mixed use development of affordable starter homes and business units, similar to the development in Fairfax Close opposite the site - this is an area of the town that is constantly referred to by Biddulph Residents as a reason to object to ANY greenfield development; A017/A019 - Derelict farm buildings and Pottery on Mow Lane, Gillow Heath (photograph attached) This is small but significant site within the greenbelt, but consists of two areas of dereliction either side of Mow Lane, this would be ideal for an "Executive Home/ Barn Conversion to produce 8 - 12 quality units, the development of which would remove a crumbling eyesore, and allow for footpath instigation on this section of Mow Lane. The footprint of the plot would be within the "brown" land with current trees being retained as a screen; A020 Land North of Woodhouse Lane, between Woodhouse Middle School and Woodhouse Farm (photograph attached) A small but significant parcel of land about the same size as Newpool which has excellent connectivity to the A527 via Woodhouse Lane, local schools and shops on Smithy Lane/Congleton Rd. Considering the land lost off Pennine Way, this would be the only development within this sector of Biddulph North; A032 Change of status from Mixed Use to Affordable Housing (photograph attached) This site was originally allocated to Mixed Use - business and housing, the close proximity to Victoria Row and Mill Hayes recreational area and the potential primary school at A050/A051 would render the site eminently more suited to 100% housing, this would be a far more acceptable proposition, with business being reallocated to the poor land at A036/A036a A036/A036a Childerplay Lane and Quarry (photograph attached) This area, although currently designated as greenbelt, is the old industrial centre of Biddulph South, on both sides of the road straddle the old Whiston Slag Company, discharged with disposing and processing iron ore slag from Robert Heath's iron works and latterly on the south side, an opencast coal mine. As a consequence, the land quality is very poor. I would propose that the northern side of the road is utilised for open air business use - re-locating the hauliers from Wharf Road in Biddulph Town, whilst the southern side bordered by Bermersley Road from "The Matador" is used as a business industrial estate; A043 Victoria Colliery Site (photograph attached) This site was promoted during and after the opencast and subsequent land reclamation as mixed	Refer to PO7364 (Mills, BD117, Childerplay Lane and Quarry, Bermersley Road, Victoria Colliery). Derelict Farm buildings on Mow Lane – Not suitable for allocation - In the Green Belt and open countryside – does not directly adjoin the town boundary. Could possibly be developed under existing NPPF policy if brownfield and new development not having a greater impact on openness of Green Belt than what is already on the site. Land north of Woodhouse Lane – Green Belt. Considered in SHLAA but C Class due to potential impact on Registered Park and Garden and National Trust property. For this reason, the site was not a site option. Site Adjacent Victoria Court, Brown Lees - Allocations need to be for a minimum of 10 dwellings in the towns. This is too small and could come forward independently of the plan as a windfall.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							business and housing with a significant public open space together with an improved former railway trackbed into the Biddulph Valley Way NCR55 - little of this has happened. The fields within the SMDC boundary adjacent to the A527 can provide a significant number of housing, the BVW NCR55 could be metalled and made into a safer route to the town centre and Brown Lees, whilst servicing a Primary School built on land at A050/A051 below. A047 Site adjacent Victoria Court, Brown Lees Rd, Brown Lees (photograph attached) A small site that could mirror the Victoria Court Apartments on Brown Lees Rd which would have good links to A527, the BVW NCR55 and new primary school at Brown Lees. A050/A051 Alternative site south and parallel to Brown Lees Rd west of BVW NCR55 (photograph attached) This is a potentially large site with excellent access to Brown Lees Rd at the head of the BVW NCR55, leading up to Brook St, if the site incorporates the unmodernised farm and outbuildings at the western head of the site. The site is large enough - especially with the potential of building a school and providing playing fields on NuL Administered Land adjacent to the site. Access could also be considered opposite Lyneside Road aside the Gardener's Arms Public House. Both myself and Councillor Chris Wood have put a lot of thought and effort into meeting the housing allocations, and request that you give due consideration to the above suggested alternative sites, that we feel would be more readily accepted by the residents of Biddulph.	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9268 PO9265	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Other Suggested Sites	Object	(Summary of comments - full comments attached) Would like to see the inclusion of a larger area immediately adjacent to site BD063a in the Local Plan as well as site BD063a (map attached). Reasons are: Delivery of additional dwellings should have a significant positive effect - the site is accessible to existing services, facilities and areas of employment; The site's district ecological importance is considered to have a negative effect, but the Phase 1 Habitat Survey (attached) demonstrates that there are no features of ecological interest that preclude the residential development of this site; Reference is made to the site's development having a significant negative effect as a result of it comprising greenfield, grade 3/4 agricultural land. However, there is a good supply of grade 3/4 land in the vicinity and furthermore the site has limited potential for agricultural purposes as a result of its size and shape and the proximity of existing dwellings; No major improvements would be required to deliver an acceptable access to serve housing development on the site in a safe manner. (see attached technical note); The land is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment and the Council comments within the Options Site Assessment that it is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with its surroundings; Disagree with the results of the Green Belt Review - it is considered that the impact of the combined site's development on the Green Belt would not be significant when considering the fairly limited depth of the site (which is just part of the wider areas of land assessed in the Green Belt Review) and how its development would form a logical extension to the ribbon of existing development along its southern boundary. The indicative site layout (attached) also demonstrates the potential to provide a defensible boundary along the northern edge of the site, which would discourage urban sprawl/further encroachment into the Green Belt; both the developer and LPA could focus and take care at planning application stage to ensure that the final form and layout of development would ensure it has an acceptable impact on the Green Belt. It is considered that these factors would limit the impact of the site's development on the Green Belt; The combined site the subject of these representations is in a more accessible and sustainable location, in much closer proximity to the town centre and most of the main existing and future sources of local employment and other local amenities than some of the other proposed housing allocations, including some that would also require amendments to the Green Belt. This is particularly the case in comparison to the preferred housing allocation references BD062, BD068 and BD087 which are all located at the northern edge of Biddulph. It is considered that the enhanced sustainability of housing	The land is Green Belt. <u>Green Belt Review (Site 3 – 2016)</u> The site is on gently rising land to the rear of Newpool Road and as such presents relatively limited visual intrusion and hence limited impact on openness, but has no significant outer boundary with which to contain development. The site appears to seek to 'round off' the settlement edge in this location between Tower Hill Road and Newpool Farm, but in so doing cuts across fields and in only one instance uses a recognisable field boundary. In addition, the site does not abut existing development off Meadowside, leaving a remnant field. Not recommended for release due to the absence of a clear outer boundary with which to properly contain development, thus preventing localised sprawl. More modest rounding-off to the east of the site could be considered, using a farm track as a boundary to development. For the above reason, this land is not recommended as a Local Plan allocation.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							development of the combined site at Newpool Farm would outweigh any differences between these sites in terms of impact on the Green Belt and that, when considered in the round, the combined site at Newpool Farm is a preferable and more logical and sustainable option than those alternative sites; The site is both accessible and sustainably located, with a realistic choice of mode of travel other than the private car - there is a range of local facilities within the 2km walk distance of the site, which include primary schools, secondary schools, supermarkets, convenience stores and GP surgeries, whilst the whole of Biddulph is within 3km and therefore within cycling distance. Bus stops are also found on Newpool Road and are currently located at the site access and despite the need to move them they would still be in close proximity to the site; Development of the site would make a contribution to local need for housing and in turn reduce the level of housing development that must be accommodated on less accessible/sustainably located greenfield land in the Green Belt around Biddulph; Contribution of the larger site towards infrastructure delivery - client anticipates the combined site being developed for housing by a single developer; Site is deliverable and is being promoted by a willing landowner; and Opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and other infill or windfall sites within the existing settlement boundary are severely limited. We would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in Biddulph and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development of the land at Newpool Farm being promoted by our client.	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9027	Mrs Helen Baker				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Further to the consultation I would like to propose the area BD137 is included in the local plan. Attached is a location map of the field, are happy for it to be considered with land adjacent also can be included for the purposes of the consultation. The land use for this site is agricultural land. The reason I believe that it should be included is that there is a national shortage of homes and government laws and publicity reflect this and indeed Cheshire east council proposed that Staffordshire councils could provide additional sites to reflect the national requirement of homes for the future. 3 Development requirements and distribution Distribution of development 3.1 Policy SS3 of the adopted Core Strategy sets out the broad spatial distribution of housing and employment development across the District. It is proposed to carry this distribution forward into the new Local Plan. However Cheshire East council announced during the local plan developments that Staffordshire council would be able to undertake some of the housing requirement on there behalf 3.2 As the proposed development approach is one which focuses development on the 3 market towns of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph so would make the area to the north of Biddulph suitable area to accommodate the additional homes. Strengths are that Biddulph Valley Way is on the field boundary to the West with good access. This provides for very good amenity facilities for dwellings. The main road (A527) from Congleton to Biddulph is on the field boundary to the East with main road frontage and gate access. The main road provides good communication which is sustainable including regular public transport to both towns of Congleton and Biddulph and within 2.5 miles connects to Congleton train station going to Manchester and London. Biddulph Leisure Centre is located on the main road to the south of the site in the direction of Biddulph town centre. Utilities are conveniently located:- Gas main on main road Sewage works across the main road in the direction of Biddulph Mains electricity at adjacent homes The consultation document prepared by Staffordshire Moorland says that they have provided space for 4000 homes. I think that this will be inadequate when presented to the government inspector for inspectors examination as neighbouring Cheshire East council local plan which was presented to government inspector for examination in 2014 was rejected and Cheshireeast East were then obliged to include provision for 36000 houses before the local plan was allowed to go thought to the next stage by the inspector Stephen Pratt. I would be glad if you could consider these issues during the consultation and include the above site.	The site was not included as a site option or identified in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries Consultation Document for the following reasons: <u>Green Belt Review</u> Parcel N7 (Land to North West of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes: - significant contribution to preventing neighbouring towns merging; - Contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built – up areas; - contribution to safeguarding countryside from encroachment; - Contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns; Permanence of GB – current boundaries are firm and largely logical. Sustainable patterns of development – “development would produce an over-extended linear settlement pattern with a limited relationship to Biddulph town proper.” <u>SHLAA</u> “Eastern part of site (and north) affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to stream. Blanket TPOs to northern part of site (Baileys Wood). This is also identified in PPG17 audit as natural and semi natural open space. Also historic earthwork here.” (c class) It is not recommended for inclusion in the Preferred Option Local Plan.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9054	Mrs Joyce Tagell			Hourigan Connolly	Other Suggested Sites	Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Object to the non-inclusion of BD083 in the Local Plan. It is considered that land at Marsh Green Road, Biddulph should be allocated for residential development to deliver in the order of 40 dwellings. The site has been identified as deliverable in the SHLAA. Neighbouring sites which have been included in the plan (BD062, BD068 and BD087) all share similar constraints to BD083. There are no constraints on the land which make it undevelopable. Its agricultural land classification is low. The assessment of the site in the Green Belt Review is inconsistent with other assessments undertaken by the Council in particular the land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. It is also self-evident that the subject site is an infill site and entirely appropriate for development. In summary land at Marsh Green Road, Biddulph is available for development, it is suitable for housing and would be achievable. In our view there is no justification for not allocating this site given the need to allocate more land than the Council has identified in order to meet the housing needs of the District going forward. We respectfully seek an allocation of the land at Marsh Green Road, Biddulph for housing and a consequential amendment to the Town Boundary for the settlement.	The Green Belt Consultants view is that the site is on rising land and the sense of openness would be compromised by development and it is disconnected from urban area, (the Biddulph Valley Way separates it from nearby residential development). For this reason it is not recommended that the site is included in the Preferred Options Local Plan.
PO9025	Mr Mark Holland				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	I would consider making land in my ownership (map attached) - estimated at around 2 acres - (adjacent to site ADD04) available for development provided that the adjacent site ADD04 is deemed suitable for housing. This is being proposed at this stage on the basis that it is in no way binding on our part.	ADD04 is not considered suitable for retention in the Local Plan due to heritage impact (its position adjacent to Knypersley Hall). The same would apply to this area of land.
PO10235	Mr Graeme Court				Other Suggested Sites	Support	Suggest old gas works site as an alternative.	Refer to PO4611.
PO9795	Mr Eric Biddle				Other Suggested Sites	Object	A majority of residents would like to see the Victoria Colliery site developed - it would take a large number of homes. Infrastructure would need improving using CIL. Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council is apparently in favour of development. Many believe that co-operation between Biddulph and Stoke on Trent could also benefit Biddulph. Stoke on Trent has vast areas of brown field land waiting to be developed. Another area is at Childerplay Lane.	Refer to PO7634 and PO4620.
PO10075	Ms Heather Mason				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Consider that Site BD004 (City Bank Mill) and site BD102 (Minster Mill) should be included in the plan. Also recommend: Victoria Colliery Childerplay Lane Mill Hayes Farm	Refer to PO7634 and PO956.
PO10073	Mr Norman Smith				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Object to BD004 (City Bank Mill) and BD102 (Minster Mill) not being included in the plan. Consider that all brownfield sites should be seriously looked at in addition to any old mills not being active and also Victoria Colliery Land, Childerplay area and similar.	Refer to PO7634 and PO956.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10131	Mrs Anne Young				Other Suggested Sites	Object	There are many derelict buildings in Biddulph - Station Road, the old Victoria Colliery site, Cross Street, land off Childerplay Road. Developing derelict buildings would tidy up the already tired looking Biddulph.	Refer to PO7634 and PO956.
PO9900	Mrs Janet Copeland				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Suggest the Victoria Colliery site and Childerplay Lane would be very suitable sites for housing and employment. This could be feasible though I am aware we are creeping away from our town boundary and nearer to Stoke on Trent. If this option is suitable I would support it rather than sacrifice our Green Belt land. A new school could also be built in this area if housing is.	Refer to PO7634 and PO956.
PO9583	Mr Carl Mason				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Consider that the following sites should be assessed for housing development instead of BD087: Victoria Colliery Childerplay Lane Knypersley Bypass Mill Hayes Farm Meadows Playing Field Jacksons Nursery	Refer to PO7634, PO956 and PO5993. Meadows Playing Field is in use by a local school.
PO9645	Mr D Copeland				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Prefer no Green Belt development, brown field land should be prioritised first e.g. old timber yard, mills in Cross Street and Station Road. Have Newcastle Borough Council been contacted about the Victoria Colliery Site? It may be suitable for housing or business though urban creep could be a problem.	Refer to PO7634.
PO9746	Mrs T Adams				Other Suggested Sites	Object	I am in favour of land to the west of Victoria Business Park near to Brown Lees for development. As former open cast mining area I feel this makes more sense. It is far enough away from existing schools, has better access for vehicles therefore causing less disruption and congestion, and most importantly does not intrude on green belt land.	Refer to PO7634.
PO9667	Mrs P Hancock				Other Suggested Sites	Object	The best site for new housing is south of G Rhodes garage - good access, handy for people working on industrial park, desirable location, open countryside, good access to town, next best site is brownfield land.	BD117 is already included in the plan as a mixed use employment / housing site.
PO9927	Mr J Wright				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Suggest the following sites to be investigated for housing development (suggested by Councillors Chris Wood and Jim Davies): Victoria Colliery Site (undeveloped part to the south). Mining history but has been reinstated. Site has good access to A527. Newcastle Borough Council has agreed this in principle; Childerplay Land - between Mill Hayes Road and recycling station at Bemersley, also reclaimed land with good access to A527; Land to south of ADD03 - lies to west of old railway line, access to the town centre via Wharf Road, residents could walk into town for shopping, medical facilities etc. Priority should be given to developing mill buildings for housing as they are ideally located.	Refer to PO7634 and PO4624.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10210	Mrs J Cottrell				Other Suggested Sites	General comment	Summary only (please see full representation attached) Support the Victoria Colliery Site and the Childerplay Road sites for housing. These two sites: would not impinge on other housing lessen road/traffic congestion more suitable for large developers who can enter into S106 infrastructure agreements	Refer to PO7634.
PO9779	Mr M Barlow				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Use brown fields for housing development such as Victoria and Childerplay Road, Knypersley. Also Chatterley Whitfield site. Knock down or regenerate the mill in Station Road, it spoils the area.	Refer to PO7634 and PO4620.
PO10058	Mrs B Purton				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Consideration should be given to the possibility of extending the town boundary on the west side of the town through site BD116 and BD140 between the currently identified area of ADD03 and site BD063a to allow for the possibility of further site allocations within this area. This development would start to rebalance Biddulph in the right direction i.e. it would start to move the town centre back towards the centre of town. A strip of visual open space could be included between the development and the Biddulph Valley Way which could also act as a wildlife corridor. These sites are well placed to take advantage of some of the new services and facilities and the new primary health care centre which is within easy walking distance. Development in this location would have much less of a visual impact on the area and would not constitute 'urban creep'.	Refer to PO4624.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9575	Water of Ayr & Tam O'Shanter Ltd	The Water of Ayr & Tam O'Shanter Hone Works Ltd	Ms Jennifer Hadland	Savills	Other Suggested Sites	Object	(Summary only - full comments and site plan attached) New site for consideration at Underwood Farm, Gillow Heath, Biddulph Land measures 14.8 hectares and residential development abuts the site to the east. The site is in single ownership and is deliverable and viable. Site could all be developed or separated into parts (A and B as shown on the attached map). Site A (north of Mow Lane) is approximately 5.5 hectares and lies to the west of existing residential development and the site is bounded by mature hedgerows. The site is relatively flat but gently slopes down towards the existing built up area. Site B (south of Mow Lane) is approximately 9.3 hectares, is well confined by existing hedgerows and trees particularly along the southern boundary. The future development of the site would utilise land which is adjacent to existing residential development. The site is relatively flat but gently slopes down towards the existing built up area. Client's land does not fully meet the 5 Green Belt purposes in the NPPF. The Council's Green Belt Review assessed the land as part of a large swathe of land but not as an individual site. It is considered that the deletion of the land and its future allocation for residential development would not have an adverse impact on the remaining Green Belt. It would not lead to merger with Congleton, will prevent unrestricted sprawl taking place whilst helping to meet the District's development needs. Land is located away from the historic centre of Biddulph so would not have an adverse effect on the character of the town but is sustainably located in terms of access to facilities and services. There is no strong settlement edge where client's land is located. A strong settlement edge could be created as part of development. Developing to the east of the town would lead to merger with Biddulph Moor but development to the west of the town would retain its rural setting.	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Not recommended for release. Development would be a clear intrusion into open countryside, without substantial boundaries with which it could be contained. A new built edge to Gillow Heath (and Biddulph) would be created which would be of a linear character and not constitute a logical rounding-off of the settlement. <u>SHLAA</u> Part A – divorced from settlement. Not assessed in SHLAA Part B – Partial SHLAA assessment – BD123 (old coal yard only – divorced from settlement – may be NPPF compliant as it is brownfield?) C class in SHLAA. BD139 – “The whole of the site has been identified in the Landscape & Settlement Setting Study as being important to the setting of the settlement. Rural character of the area. Wedgewood Lane provides a strong edge to the settlement at this point. FRA needed.” – C class. Not recommended for inclusion in the Local Plan for the reasons above.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9030	The Hart Family		Rob Duncan		Other Suggested Sites - BD067 a-c	Object	(Summary only - full version attached) Object to sites BD067a-c being excluded from the Local Plan. Consider that there is no prescribed methodology for how the sites have been assessed and why new sites for Biddulph have emerged which were not included at the previous consultation stage e.g. site ADD03. Do not agree with some of the conclusions of the Council's Green Belt Review - overplays the significance of the site in terms of preventing towns merging together, challenge view that Biddulph is a historic town as it has no conservation area, suggest revised assumptions which would deem these sites as being suitable for release from the Green Belt. The land in question has a higher development capacity study ranking than other sites in Biddulph included as preferred options. The attached plan demonstrates how effective screening can be accommodated on the site to strengthen its boundaries. The sites were categorised as deliverable in the SHLAA as opposed to sites ADD04 and ADD03 which were both categorised as undeliverable in the SHLAA. The Local Highway Authority does not raise concerns about highway safety matters. The site overall scores fairly low in terms of its ecological credentials, and it is submitted that the substantial structural landscaping identified within the accompanying layout plan would derive significant benefits to local biodiversity in accordance with the aims of paragraph 109 of the NPPF. Site has the potential to deliver substantial developer contributions to benefit the town e.g. affordable housing, bungalows, extra care housing, open space, children's play areas. Also owner is willing to safeguard a substantial parcel of land to enable Oxhey First School to expand. Site is owned in full by client and available for development immediately. The Local Authority is accordingly requested to re-visit its intended preferred options, and prioritise my client's site ahead of the other preferred options within the Submission Version of the Site Allocations DPD.	The Green Belt Review does not consider that this area is suitable for release from the Green Belt therefore it is not proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan Preferred Options.
PO9038	Mr & Mrs J Hibbert		John Grantham		Other Suggested Sites - BD138a / BD138b	Object	Object to the non inclusion of sites BD138a and BD138b in the Local Plan. The land in question (location plan attached) is approximately 15 acres in size. I believe this land would make a good contribution to the Council's housing targets going forward. Allowing for the topography of said land I would envisage approximately 8-10 acres of housing development land, equating to approximately 100-130 dwellings being delivered. A phased development over a 3-5 year period could be achievable and could be economically viable. The land sits adjacent to the existing settlement of Biddulph. The land is in a sustainable area, Biddulph benefitting from all local services expected from a medium sized town. I hope you will agree that this land offers great potential in assisting the Council improving their housing shortfall targets.	The Green Belt Review does not consider that this area is suitable for release from the Green Belt therefore it is not proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan Preferred Options.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9561	Ms Christine Williams				Other Suggested Sites BD131	Object	Request that land associated with 62 Mill Hayes Road (your reference BD131 - see attached map) be considered for release from the Green Belt. The land extends to 6.35 acres and has a road frontage which would provide the best point of access into land north of Mill Hayes Road.	<u>Green Belt Review</u> Allows for release of the land if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. <u>Other Issues</u> If developed alone appears incongruous – would have to be part of a wider development for this area. Close to a site of geological importance. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.
PO491	Mrs May Pointon	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Other Suggested Sites Marsh Green Nursery	Object	Land to the north of Well Lane, Gillow Heath, Biddulph, Stoke-on-Trent. On behalf of my client I object to the omission of an area of land of land north of Well Lane, Gillow Heath, from the proposed Development Boundary for Biddulph and ask that the site is released from the Green Belt and included in the Town Development Boundary. The site was not submitted as part of the Site Options Consultations in 2015 but Mrs Pointon contends that the site as a nursery (appears as developed land rather than as part of the Green Belt. The site lies to the north-east of Site BD138b which was included in the Site Options Consultation in 2015 but is not one of the preferred site allocations. The Green Belt Review commissioned by the Council assessed each site against the five purposes of the Green Belt. In the case of Site 138b the assessment was that the site made: A contribution to checking sprawl. A limited contribution to maintaining separation. A significant contribution to preventing encroachment. A moderate contribution to the overall impact on the Green Belt purposes of development. The Review recommended that the site is not released from the Green Belt. Mrs Pointon asks that the site is omitted from the Green Belt and included in the proposed Village Development Boundary for the following reasons: The site is different from Site BD138b and Site BD138a which lies to the south of Site 138b in that where the two latter sites are open land my client's land is a well-developed nursery with several portal framed buildings, two houses, a retail area, access tracks, areas of hardstanding and numerous polytunnels. The Review's description of Sites 138a and 138b is " Broadly rising land lying outside the current settlement envelope beyond Well Lane. Despite the intrusion of isolated built development, the land retains a clear open countryside character, development of which would create visual intrusion, and compromise openness, notwithstanding the boundaries provided by Wedgewood Lane/Marshfield Land and an unmade	<u>Green Belt Review Assessment – April 2017</u> Consider for release under Exceptional Circumstances. Notwithstanding the contribution of the land to the Green Belt in this locality, development would not cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt, reflecting the bounded nature of the site and the character of existing built form, combining both residential properties and the garden nursery. Of the two options, the smaller would be less damaging, being more closely related to the current built edge at Well Lane and limiting the interface with open countryside to the north west. However, there is no obvious significant feature between the two options which would serve as a reasonable long term boundary. <u>SCC Highways</u> Marsh Green Road is poor and would really need some improvement before I could be comfortable with development using it as access. It would need at least widening but if sites BD068 and BD083 are still proposed, these would be significantly beneficial. All sites could then contribute to improvements at Marsh Green Road/Congleton Road junction. BD083 would be essential. The existing traffic generation of the existing use as nursery could be taken into account to offset against the proposed residential use. Transport Statement would be required. However, given the poor geometry and alignment of Marsh Green Road, some improvement would be essential for any sizeable development. An alternative site exists which will help to bring forward a key regeneration area in a central part of the town so land on this site is not needed.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							track to Congleton Edge Road.”. It is contended that my client’s site – The Nursery – is completely different to Sites 138a & b. To all intents and purposes to a lay person it appears as developed land occupied as it is with a retail area, car park and buildings mainly to the front (south-east) of the site with polytunnels, two houses and another building on the rest of the site. It is accepted that horticultural land is “previously developed land. However, a recent appeal (APP/j3720/W/15/3010653) for the construction of up to 75 dwellings was allowed on a horticultural nursery on 6 June 2016 in open countryside in a valued landscape. Whilst a “valued landscape” is not the same as Green Belt the Inspector on this appeal considered that because of the several buildings and the glass houses on the site “a significant part of the site could not be described as open or green field land”. The inspector also mentioned that the site faces a terrace of houses and that when walking up the road to the site the perception is “a partially built site”. In the case of Pointon’s nursery whilst there are open fields to either side of the site there is a sizable modern housing are across Well Lane and the perception when looking at the site from well Lane is of a partially well developed site which is in context with the houses on the opposite side of the road. With respect to the purposes of the Green Belt it is contended that the site already sprawls and encroaches into the countryside and Green Belt; that there is already considerable visual intrusion; and that development of the land would at worst only have a limited impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. Two plans showing two options for the development of the site are sent separately by email. The first plan titled “Option 1” (drawing no. SOP2106-4) shows the entire site. The second plan titled “Option 2” (drawing no; SOP2016-5) shows the front part of the site available for development. The Council are asked to consider both options for development. My client would prefer to see the entire site developed but puts Option 2 forward for consideration as well. The number of houses that could be built in Option 1 (the site area is about 1.52 ha) is between 37-44 houses assuming moderate densities and the number of houses which could be built on Option 2 (about 0.7 ha in area) assuming similar densities would be about 17-20 houses. The site has good access onto Well Road and there is a tarmacked track to the north which could be made wider using land in the site to provide a second access point. If the entire site were to be developed there are recognisable permanent boundaries – Well Road, the track to the north-east, a house and field boundary to the south-west and a narrow road (Wedgewood Lane) maintained by the County Council to the north-east. If Option 2 were pursued then the boundaries to the north-west, south-	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							west and south-east would be the same but a permanent feature would need to be established in the north-east.	
PO9051	Mr and Mrs Siddorn		G Willard	Willard Willard	Other Suggested Sites BD138a / BD138b	Object	(Summary - full comments and plan attached) Object to the non-inclusion of sites BD138a and BD138b in the Local Plan. The sites are available and considered to be deliverable for the following reasons: Deliverability The site is in the ownership of only 2 parties. Both are able and willing to sell the sites in order for them to be developed. There is no legal incumbrance to prevent or slow down the sale of the site. Around 170 homes could be provided. Highways The Highway Authority state: The Highway Authority has no difficulties in principle with this development provided that appropriate highway standards can be achieved. Cumulative development in this area would need to be assessed through a TA. This remains the council's position. It is however conceivable that the development of this could include further highway and planning gains to the surrounding road network and for pedestrians and cyclists (see attached plan). Green Belt Impact The site (a and b) is not identified within the Green Belt Review as being suitable for housing. This submission contests both that conclusion and the weight that ought to be attributed to it. Suggest alternative wording for the conclusion in relation to this site: The site is bounded by residential development to the East, South and to some extent the North. It is well contained with Wedgwood Lane enclosing the site to the West. The site is open but is well screened. The site too is free of any development constraints. The site is considered to have a moderate impact upon the Green Belt and note especially that the site is well contained. It ought to be considered for release from the Green Belt. SHLAA Site ADD03 was identified as a C class in the SHLAA and was not included in the previous Site Options Consultation. Sites BD138 a and b are both classed as B and were included in the previous consultation. Sustainable Site It is contested that the loss of grade 4 farmland is not a significant loss to sustainability. And moreover there is no indication of any adverse impact upon any historic assets or ecology. Ecology The site owner supports the conclusions set out in the Council's Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the sites and proper site development can take place whilst complying with these conclusions. It is notable too that Natural England consider that this may represent a strategic site and subject to a suitable LVIA would support the allocation. Flooding The site is not within a flood zone nor would it be affected by flooding given its underlying geology and topography and for the greater part much of the site is sloping. Moreover because of the size	The Green Belt Review does not consider that this area is suitable for release from the Green Belt therefore it is not proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan Preferred Options.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							of the site it is wholly practicable to provide for storm water attenuation on site in the form of swales, balancing ponds or underground storage. In short there is no need for this site to add to local storm water flows and it is considered acceptable in these terms. Environmental Risk Whilst Groundsure has determined the property to comprise Acceptable Environmental Risk, some liabilities may reside with the property that a prudent purchaser may wish to consider further, particularly if the site is to change use/be redeveloped in the future. Ground conditions There are ground constraints on this site and no serious risk have been identified from any previous local mine working. Service provision. The site is served by water, foul sewage, broadband, electricity and mains gas infrastructure. Public footpath The site is served by a public footpath which crosses the site. This could and ought to be included within any site layout provision. Market interest The site has attracted the interest of a national volume house-builder. They withdrew from completing an option agreement with the council upon learning of the council's likely draft allocations because contesting and properly contesting a site thru the plan making process is a time consuming and expensive exercise. At the time of preparing this submission the site owner is being approached by land agents who also may have interested clients. The previous involvement of a national house-builder does serve to confirm that there would indeed be a developer within the marketplace who would develop the site if it were to be allocated. School The combined BD138 a and BD138b sites are big enough to accommodate a new primary school site. They have good road connections and are well served by existing public transport routes. In addition these sites adjoin existing housing areas in a part of the town not already served by a primary school site meaning that access for children is both secure, safe and quick. Moreover the site is close to the Halls Road Playing fields providing children with extensive open space provision close to the school in addition to any on site play and sports space. The linking of the site via improved and new cycle routes and green lane would also offer children and parents a safe and secure choice of routes to school.	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9293 PO9291	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Other Suggested Sites Hurst Quarry	Object	(Summary of comments - full comments attached) Would like to see land at Hurst Quarry, Hurst Road, Biddulph considered for inclusion in the Local Plan for housing development (see attached plan) for the following reasons: The site is currently washed over by Green Belt. However, the site has a history of use as a quarry (see attached aerial photo) shows how the extensive extraction workings resulting from previous quarrying activity has significantly altered the appearance of the site and physically and visually damaged the local landscape. In addition to the quarrying activity there is an industrial premises at the site's frontage with Hurst Road, which comprises previously developed land. This business would be relocated in the event that housing development of the site comes forward. All of the site therefore comprises previously worked and developed land; Whilst the site's planning history includes details of an approved restoration plan for the quarry element of the site (i.e. excluding the industrial premises at the front of the site), we understand that under European legislation the site can continue to be used as a quarry for many years to come and if this were to take place it would result in considerable further damage to the landscape; A sensitively designed residential development of the site on the other hand presents the potential to bring forward the ceasing of quarrying activity at the site - prior therefore to quarrying having any further impacting on the currently unspoilt land at the site - and in turn deliver a number of benefits including: The removal of the HGV and other vehicle movements associated with further quarrying at the site and the existing engineering business from the local highway network, to the benefit of highway safety and the amenity of local residents; Further improvements to the residential amenity of local residents including by way of removing the impact of quarrying at the site by way of dust, noise and vibration; Positive effects on/enhancements to the local landscape and visual amenity; Improvements to the setting of Biddulph Grange and Biddulph Grange Gardens; and The potential to enhance biodiversity in the local area and avoid further tree loss that may result from further quarrying activity at the site, whilst low quality self-seeded trees within the site that would be removed to accommodate the proposed development would be replaced by native tree planting; The consultation document confirms an estimated housing need of 1,100 dwellings in Biddulph over the plan period and the Core Strategy acknowledges that housing development will need to take place on land in the Green Belt on the edge of Biddulph in order to meet this requirement. Housing development at Hurst Quarry creates the potential to make a material contribution to the housing requirements in Biddulph and in turn reduce the level of housing development required on virgin greenfield land	<u>Green Belt Review:</u> Parcel N8 (Land to north east of Biddulph) – Contribution towards the following GB purposes: • Check unrestricted sprawl; • Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment; • Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Permanence of GB – Characterised by strong logical boundaries along inner and outer edges. Sustainable patterns of development – development not appropriate. This land is not recommended for inclusion in the Local Plan due to impact new development would have on the Green Belt and its unsustainable location.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							in the Green Belt; Community engagement has been undertaken and there is support for residential development on the site - a planning application has been submitted; Client is only to promoting residential development of the parts of the site that have been subject to previous quarrying activity (which are naturally at a lower level than the surrounding land) and that accommodate the industrial premises at the site frontage. These parts of the site are well contained and a carefully designed residential scheme and associated landscape strategy - such as those submitted in connection with the current outline application - would deliver a high quality housing scheme of low prominence/visual impact that would protect the previously unspoilt higher ground within the wider site from future change and in turn avoid harmful impact on the wider landscape; The proposed housing development is acceptable from a highways, landscape, tree, ecology, flood risk and drainage, minerals sterilisation, ground conditions and urban design perspective as proven in supporting documents submitted with the planning application (see attached planning statement for more details); An assessment of the viability of the proposal has also been undertaken to inform the planning application, which has resulted in the planning application proposing 100% open market housing on the site and a financial contribution (£500,000) towards off-site affordable housing provision; The planning application is also accompanied by a Heritage Assessment that demonstrates the proposed housing development of the site would not affect the architectural, historical, archaeological or artistic significance of Biddulph Grange; A Highway Assessment has been produced and demonstrates that a suitable site access exists and development would not lead to a serious impact on the local highway network; and the site would make a positive contribution towards the local need for housing. We would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in and around Biddulph and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development of the land at Hurst Quarry. The purpose of these representations is to request that the LPA gives further consideration to the potential allocation of land at Hurst Quarry for housing development. The site area is approximately 15.5 hectares (and the landowner also owns additional adjoining land), but as considered in more detail below and within the planning application it is not envisaged that the entire site will come forward.	

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Other Suggested Sites)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10218	Mr Stuart Nicholls				Other Suggested Sites	Object	Areas which could be designated for building which would not impact on residents are land off Childerplay Road and the former Victoria Colliery site. Although I strongly believe that building should not take place on Green Belt land, I understand that the town has to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to achieve the objectives set by the Government. Land in these areas which has recently been designated as Green Belt should be used as this is less established and more suitable. Also suggest land on the west side of Biddulph bypass at Woodside Farm. The Biddulph Valley Way would act as a natural green strip between here and the site to the east. Access roads could be linked to the bypass either over or under the BVW avoiding the extra traffic on already overstretched local roads and lanes.	Refer to PO7634 and PO4624.
PO10283	Mr Alan Brown				Other Suggested Sites	Object	I believe that the site on Childerplay Lane represents a better option rather than ADD03.	Refer to PO7634.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Town Centre)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO166	Mrs Tracy Norton				Town Centre		Either pedestrianize the High Street, or make it all accessible to cars, rather than as it is now.	In recent years the road layouts have changed in Biddulph Town Centre and it would be up to the Highway Authority at the County Council if they consider any further changes are necessary. They have not advised the District Council as such. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO186	Mrs Shirley Barlow				Town Centre		Keep it looking nice either Biddulph in bloom and replace the 2 trees that were cut down in front of the town hall, need a few small trees in the large tubs to enhance the town	Comments noted.
PO539 PO599	Mr Bill Hockey Mrs Pamela Hockey				Town Centre	Support	All my Comments against the previous questions are aimed at supporting the regeneration of Biddulph Town Centre. I strongly recommend: Holding Market Days at times and days when working people can attend, and not mid-week when people only want to get home, eat and rest. It is no wonder that what is arranged has few and uninteresting stalls and poor attendance. The example of the few weekend Markets show the difference. A dedicated Market Area – just consider Congleton, Hanley and even Manchester at Christmas and at other times! Encourage and nurture links with Biddulph Grange. If even some of the people visiting there come into Biddulph the impact could be significant on Trader and Council income. Developing a plan around the Primary & secondary Frontage Strategy that makes the Town Centre an attractive place to come to and spend, something it definitely is not now. Make the High Street a pedestrian zone, learn from Congleton and others. Building to the West is closer to the potential £0.5 million business development at the Chatterley & Whitfield site understood to offer the opportunity for creating 2,100 jobs. It is also closer to the already planned new employment areas than other sites. Makes walking to work possible and more attractive against the likelihood of going by car from sites north of it, especially with their less direct routes.	Comments noted. Regeneration works have taken place in the town centre in the last few years – a new foodstore, paving, shop front improvements, bus station etc. Market days are outside the remit of the Local Plan. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO736	Mr Philip Beech				Town Centre	Support	The regeneration of Biddulph Town (Shopping) Centre needs to be addressed. A market day would be beneficial - NOT on a week day when the majority of people with disposable income are out a work. Maybe a Sunday market, like Macclesfield have, may be more beneficial to the Town than a traditional Saturday market. To encourage development maybe the 'powers that be' could heavily subsidise this by offering drastically reduced fees for traders willing to sign up to the scheme. Also, temporary closure of certain roads should be considered to permit said market. This happened in adjacent towns and their events are well attended it would seem.	Market days are outside of the Local Plan remit.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Town Centre)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Biddulph isn't a bad town, but could I believe do far better.	
PO618	Mrs Ellen Faulkner				Town Centre	General comment	I know we will have to have houses eventually. I feel that some of the shops could be encouraged to improve the upper floors of their premises for apartments or bed sits.	Agreed. The Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan (which is still a live policy document) encourages the conversion of upper floors in the main shopping area to residential (Policy STRAT3).
PO459	Mrs Jean Fairbanks				Town Centre	Support	Biddulph has been neglected for many years and badly needs investment and good ideas to stimulate shoppers to come into and stay in the town centre. People living on the outskirts have limited access by bus if they do not possess a car.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre – a new foodstore, paving, shop front improvements, bus station etc. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. The retail industry in particular is very sensitive to change and the increases in people shopping online are affecting the amount of physical stores operators require.
PO797	Mrs Jayne Beech				Town Centre	Support	Biddulph would benefit from events to attract more tourism. The summer series of events seems to cater for local residents, as opposed to people from outside. A weekly market would go some way to improving this - especially around bank holiday weekends and Christmas time. Also, the use of the Town Hall to host music events and films would be beneficial. This would help keep people in Biddulph and may go some way to attract people from outside the area.	These suggestions are outside of the Local Plan remit.
PO4856	Mr Chris Millington				Town Centre	Object	Town Centre needs to be regenerated starting with housing near the centre so people don't by pass to stoke or Congleton. Need to attract visitors into town centre. Concerned regarding sewage works in general infrastructure. Agree to take out more buildings in the North East.	Comments noted. United Utilities has a statutory duty to provide capacity for new development so this is not a valid reason for development not to come forward in Biddulph.
PO5193	Mr Peter Brittain				Town Centre	General comment	Intervene now to stop expansion of empty shops.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre – a new foodstore, paving, shop front improvements, bus station etc. Any further improvements are likely to be market-led and dependent on the amount of new development which occurs in the town. The retail industry in particular is very sensitive to change and the increases in people shopping online are affecting the amount of physical stores operators require.
PO5098	Mr J Neate				Town Centre	Support	The recommendations regarding the Market Days/dedicated market area/link the Excellent.	These suggestions are outside of the Local Plan remit.
PO5097	Mrs L Neate				Town Centre	Support	The recommendations regarding the Market Days/dedicated market area/link the Excellent.	These suggestions are outside of the Local Plan remit.
PO5351	Mr I Barber				Town Centre	Support	Regeneration of the town centre can only be achieved if the High Street was made pedestrian zone, if the town was more attractive you can attract more visitors with Biddulph Grange Gardens to spend there.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Town Centre)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO5167	Mr N McQuade				Town Centre	General comment	plus electric car charging points, enforce no parking on grass verges?	These are matters which are outside the remit of the Local Plan.
PO5313	Mr A Picken				Town Centre	Support	To attract more people into the town centre, the developments need to be within walking distance.	Agreed.
PO9845	Mrs. Margaret Biddle				Town Centre	Object	Regeneration of the town centre is needed. The High Street should be a pedestrian zone. Weekend market days are popular in many towns. There must be a way to encourage visitors to Biddulph Grange to come to the town centre. Improving the christmas lights would be a start. Biddulph in Bloom shows what can be done. Factories in the town could be converted to residential to provide living accommodation.	There has been recent regeneration of the town centre – a new foodstore, paving, shop front improvements, bus station etc. Market days are outside the remit of the Local Plan. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future. Mills such as Minster Mill and Yarn Mill in the town centre are being considered as possibilities for housing (either conversion or new build).
PO9808	Mr Eric Biddle				Town Centre	Object	The High Street needs to be a pedestrian zone then some of the Biddulph Grange visitors could be encouraged to visit the town. It needs to be more attractive. Ugly factories should be removed or converted into apartments.	When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future. Mills such as Minster Mill and Yarn Mill in the town centre are being considered as possibilities for housing (either conversion or new build).
PO9648	Mr D Copeland				Town Centre	General comment	Would like more open space in the town centre. Should consider using land to the front and side of the Town Hall to create space. Pedestrianisation along part of High Street would be beneficial, need to create a dedicated area for the open market and improve public realm with seating and trees. The centre of town needs substantial regeneration. Also need an improved bus services so there are other issues to consider not just house building.	Use of land around the Town Hall could be improved independently of the Local Plan process. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future. Market days are outside the remit of the Local Plan. Public transport is a County Council matter and not within the scope of the Local Plan.

Question 23 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Biddulph? (Town Centre)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support/Object/General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9968	Ms Claire Kirkham				Town Centre	Object	Make the High Street a pedestrian zone and have a dedicated market area holding markets at times when working people can attend. I understand that Biddulph needs to take control through Neighbourhood Planning or risk developments running wild which has happened in other places.	Market days are outside the remit of the Local Plan. When the Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan was being produced (2004 – 2006) pedestrianisation of the High Street was considered as an option and it proved controversial with a number of businesses along High Street at that time. There is a policy in this plan which allows for pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation of the High Street but this has not been implemented to date and is unlikely to be in the near future.
PO10211	Mrs J Cottrell				Town Centre	General comment	(Summary) The brownfield sites in the town centre could be developed for new housing to visually improve and enhance the town centre. Do not need new shops/retail to be built, the High Street has empty shops which could be utilised for new traders.	The brownfield sites in the town centre including the mills are being investigated for residential development. Those which are available and viable will be included. The Council's Retail Study agrees that the town centre does not need any further retail expansion. It only recommends that a site for a discount foodstore on the edge of the centre is allocated in the Local Plan.
PO9783	Mr M Barlow				Town Centre	Object	Make the High Street open to traffic both ways - it does not work at the moment for people approaching the town centre from Congleton Road.	In recent years the road layouts have changed in Biddulph Town Centre and it would be up to the Highway Authority at the County Council if they consider any further changes are necessary. They have not advised the District Council as such.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4925	M Mitchell				Object	(Biddulph) Roads and schools cannot cope with the extra demands. The sewage works cannot cope with the extra demand. Not enough amenities to cope with the demand (buses, police etc.): Green Belt is Green Belt for a reason.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4931	Ms Philippa Swindells				Object	I object to the following site: BD062 for the following reasons; Mow Lane has over the years got more and more busy and more dangerous and cannot cope with more traffic. Over the past 2 years there have been many accidents outside our home do to speeding and the width of the road. I regularly walk my 10 yr old son to and from school and I wonder why I bother it's so dangerous – there will one day be an accident and a serious one. Sewage works – there is already a foul smell on a regular basis which will only get worse. I do wonder why anyone would want to purchase a home that close. I walk every day with my dog along that route and there is wildlife and rabbits + buzzards to name a few. Dr – how would I get an appointment at Biddulph Drs Surgery? I have to wait for an appointment after ringing at least 3 times to try to get the an available appointment then only to be told there are none left after calling from 8am.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4929	Mr R Milner				Object	I have objections to any development of Gillow Heath because: It is Green Belt Land It is an area of important bio diversity and wildlife, Gillow Heath suffers from regular raw sewage odours, building right next to that would place the residents with many days of keeping the door and windows shut and possibly ill health to young children. During heavy rain raw sewage has been seen to back fill & pollute the Biddulph Brook. Essex Drive residents already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes, such as odour and raw sewage flooding. Extra load on an already over loaded sewage works can only make things worse. Above all the road's into this site are to narrow, which is contradict the SMDC LDF core strategy Policy T1.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4930	Mrs B Milner				Object	I have objections to the development of the site ref: BD062 (Gillow Heath as follows: Proximity to already inadequate sewage works. Inadequate infrastructure Wildlife and biodiversity requirements It is a Green Belt site. It is a flood site, and wet meadow. The land has an unfettered community access should be designated as visual open space. 3 public rights of way cross this Land.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Significant house building in Biddulph will increase the load on a sewage works, which is already struggling to cope. This issue needs to be addressed prior to any building consent being awarded.	
PO4923	Mr D Smith				Object	Biddulph I object to building on this site for the following reasons. The SMDC local phase 1 habitat survey concluded the site is not recommended for potential development, it is the only site surveyed where this was concluded, showing that other site are more suitable. The site contains UK and Staffordshire biodiversity action plan priority habitats and species and potential to be species rich farmland site. It is very well connected to other bio diverse habitats (evidenced in the phase 1 habitat survey) I feel that the field offer lots of wildlife a home. I have seen badgers, foxes, newts, numerous wild birds. I also feel that the field is far too close to the sewage works and it would be ludicrous to build right next to the plant. The site shares a boundary with the only sewage works in Biddulph which is already working over its capacity population of 17000people. Local residents on Essex Drive /York Close/ Long Valley Road/ and Marsh Green already experience unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes such as odour and raw sewage flooding	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO1179	Mr D Young				Object	Biddulph Access on Akesmore Lane is poor will not take any more cars noise and pollution/more litter kids roaming up and down we do not want affordable homes built here lower the tone of the neighbourhood school, should have been built at the Old Meadows site where a school once was this is a green belt.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4919	MR LEWIS WILLIAMS				Object	I fully support objections 1-6 in the summary of objections in respect of the site number BD062 which I consider valid and appropriate to this site.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4926	Mrs B Ratcliffe				Object	Biddulph site The small from the sewage is unacceptable, this site is right up the sewage works. There have been loads of problems with the sewage flooding and going into the brook. It is working well over its capacity it is meant to, this plot of land links the brook to the Biddulph Valley way there are wildlife and plants some of which are rare. These things are important to me we all need nature. On a safety aspect there is no more access to this site other	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						than Mow Lane/Essex Drive/York Close. Mow Lane is very narrow, there are no footpaths, there has been a lot of money spent on the playing fields and access to that is Mow Lane. There are more families and children using the fields. There is a sharp bend into Essex Drive, and there are two more sharp bends on York Close. Here are two more pinch points this site is totally unsuitable on safety aspects alone. The Victoria Colliery site would be ideal.	
PO4927	Mr K Davies				Object	Biddulph Due to the fact that I live on a flood prone area i.e. Mow Lane the current sewerage/surface water system cannot cope at the present time, therefore building any additional properties will only make the situation worse. Plus Mow Lane doesn't have a pavement and when flooded pedestrians have to wade through sewage. Whilst taking the children to school.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4928	Mrs C Hensor				Object	Biddulph For the last 40 years the public rights off way have been used by the local people and the open space supports it local wildlife, and does its job of reducing flooding. Access to the exit roads for construction or emergency vehicles would be severely restricted or impossible. Access to the site via existing roads for construction of emergency vehicles would be severely restricted or almost impossible.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4920	Mrs S Wilshaw				Object	Biddulph Close proximity to the sewage works – Local residents in and around York Close/Essex Drive already gave a great deal of experience with the foul odours. In addition in periods of heavy rain (of which there are many) raw sewage floods the system, back fills and pollutes the brook. The proposed additional housing would be even closer to these unacceptable amenity impacts in their homes: a complete contradiction of the SMDC LDF core strategy policy 4. Habitat and biodiversity – The SMDC local plan phase 1habitat survey concluded that BD062 is the only site that was surveyed, which was not recommended for potential development. This site forms part of the exceptional wildlife corridor linking Biddulph Brook and the Biddulph Valley Way. Its inclusion for the development contradicts the 2006 act which places a	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						duty on all public authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving the biodiversity. Highway and Emergency access – Mow Lane (the distributor roads) and York Close/Essex Drive are too narrow, and the road bends are too small. There are 2 pinch points over the bridges on Mow Lane which cannot be avoided as there is no alternative access to this site. In addition Mow Lane is a dangerous road with no footpath, and highly risky junction where it joins with Congleton Road. Further, when the playground is completed on Halls Road playing fields, when the playground this will only serve to increase the likelihood of both more traffic, and pedestrians. Finally, the layout of all these roads precludes all scope for any additional improvements. 40 additional houses and working parents would make both the feeder road and distributor roads, intolerable for everyone concerned. Green Belt and flood risk – This site is currently protected by Green Belt and only considered suitable for release under exceptional circumstances. Removing it prioritises development under the circumstances. Removing it prioritises development in the floodplain. Exceptional circumstances have not been met or demonstrated, as there are other suitable sites for development.	
PO4921	Mr R Wilshaw				Object	My objections to BD062 being used for housing development are as follows: Close proximity to sewage works – on several occasions during heavy rain periods, raw sewage floods from the man hole/inspection cover to the Biddulph Brook. Access to site BD062 – the feeder roads, York Close and Essex rive are both far too narrow to accommodate a further 40 properties, which could easily translate to 80 cars/vehicles, these roads struggle with existing traffic. The distributor roads with two fixed narrow bridges that with increased traffic would be significant accident areas. The site is constantly wet with surface water –with housing construction of the site, this will create a flood risk at the lower end of the fields and the tree/shrub land obviously increases this threat. Unique site: Because the site is probably the only Biddulph that has a wildlife corridor of the Biddulph Valley Way and the Biddulph Brook creating a well-connected biodiverse habitat with a wet site.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4918	Mrs S Harper				Object	Biddulph	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						When we 1 st moved here the area was very quiet. Children could play in the street there was little traffic on Mow Lane. Now, the road has become a virtual car park. Every house as 2 cars, Mow Lane is like a major highway with cars in and out of Essex Drive. I have lost 2 wing mirrors and 4 tyres in Mow Lane, having being forced off the road by speeding vans in the middle of the road. This situation will only be made worse if there is an increase in traffic.	
PO4917	Mr G Harper				Object	Biddulph f this land is lost it will have a devastating effect on my special needs daughter it is the only place she feels happy and relaxed feeding the bird's squirrels, badgers etc. She is unable to cope with crowds + hustle and bustle around her, Mow Lane is a nightmare road it is so thin and had 4 blind bends and no sidewalks/pavements.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4915	Mr A Barbeard				Object	Regarding the proposals to build BD062 in Gillow Heath in my opinion as a HGV driver due to the plans a heavy amount of traffic/HGV's will have to drive down Mow Lane to deliver materials to the site. This would be dangerous for pedestrian and other car users due to the width of Mow Lane. Mow Lane has no pavements for pedestrians and has very sharp blind bends. This would cause a huge congestion because HGV will not be able to pass the parked cars or buses safely on the opposite side of the road. Access is in and out of York Close is also very narrow and of a dangerous width. Most of the times cars are parked up on the road which will mean a HGV will have to drive on the pavement to pass. If two HGV's meet on the pavement to pass due to the width of York Close it means that one of the vehicles has to drive up the pavement to allow enough room to pass. If two HGVs meet each other on Mow Lane everything will come to a standstill. Here we have the name of some HGV drivers who between them have 176 years between them of HGV driving.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4913	Mrs P kelly				Object	Biddulph My husband and I have lived in our bungalow since it was built in 1970 when it was 1 st built and the rest of the estate was a building site. We watched the homes being built and the roads being laid. Our children played in the street without fear of being knocked over. Over the years families got cars, some got 2 or 3, so our road	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						became impassable. Now cars are parked in the roads and the pavements as well as their drives, vans, cars and lorry's have to mount the pavement if two cars are parked side by side not even a bike can get passed, sometimes pedestrians can't pass the cars If they are parked on the pavement because there is no room. Vans and lorry's have to use our drive to turn around, which has now become a hazard to children and all of the residents. Hoping to put another 40 residents there in the field next to York Close beggar's belief as our road cannot take anymore, not to mention the blind bends where you can't see what coming round the corner. We also can't take any more smell from the sewage, the raw sewage in the field when it gets over run, the flooding in the field when we have heavy rain, which is like a marsh 12 months of the year. Now more sewers has started to smell is in the bedrooms, our field our sinks and not to mention the grids.	
PO4914	Mr P kelly				Object	Biddulph Roads to this site not good enough for the amount of traffic using it. Sewage works not capable to take any more waste. Flooding occurs in field the field has wildlife in it.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4901	Mr B Barcoft				Object	Biddulph Unacceptable added traffic, preserve the Green Belt that gives Biddulph its charm.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4890	Mrs K Hallam				Object	BD062 - I have lived in Mow Lane since 1972 when it was a nice little village and country lane – as the name suggests. Over the years it has got busier and the traffic to have got bigger. Since there is no pavement or even room to put one on it will become more of a hazard to walk the children to and from school are in constant danger. Therefore I don't see how building on this site a group of houses is a viable proposition. I don't see that the sewage facility could support that increase to the population.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites
PO4924	Mrs P Hindmarsh				Object	Biddulph As a resident of Mow Lane for a number of years and seen how congested it get with the buses and lorry's and busses and the narrow bends. I cannot see more volume in cars helping this road, plus no footpath also hinders the walking of children to school. Also sewage is a problem in Mow Lane if it rains it comes up the drains	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						and into gardens, so more houses will put more strain on this articulated	
PO4633	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Object	Biddulph Fronting Woodhouse Lane (from Weathercock Farm) - Build on frontage 1 house deep only New site needs investigation, recommended for inclusion.	See site table for specific comments on individual sites

This page is intentionally left blank

Question 24 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO335	Mr & Mrs Harrison	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Object	LAND TO THE WEST OF FRIAR'S CLOSE, CHEADLE . On behalf of my clients, the site owners, Mr & Mrs Harrison (address supplied). I object to the omission of site from the proposed residential allocations. My clients put forward the site in a letter dated 18 September 2015 as part of the Site Options consultations. A location plan was submitted with the letter. The reasons for objecting to the exclusion of the site are: Although the site is outside the proposed Town Boundary and in the Green Belt it is within walking distance of the town centre, shops and services and is immediately available for development. Access to the site is via an existing access from Friar's Close and was shown on the previously submitted plan. Whilst the site is in the Green Belt and below the threshold for display in the Local Plan development for housing would make beneficial use of the land which is currently mown grass and not in agricultural use and because of its location away from farms is not suitable for agricultural use. It is immediately adjacent to modern housing and development would not have a significant effect on the wider landscape character. The woodland to the west would provide a clear, recognisable and permanent boundary to the site and the Green Belt. Development on this site would not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt (preventing sprawl, encroachment, merger, protecting the setting of historic towns and urban regeneration). Whilst the land would be developed the site is contained by the surrounding properties and woodland. Because of the number of houses proposed the site is not specifically assessed in the Council's Green Belt Review however in the Review the site is in the S13 sub-zone where its contribution to preventing sprawl, merger, and assisting urban regeneration is considered to be limited. The Review considers that the zone does make a contribution towards the setting of the town and preventing encroachment. However, it is contended that because of the site's location between houses and woodland development would not lead to encroachment as it would involve only a small part of the sub-zone from which it is visually separated by the woodland. Further, because of its setting against a backdrop of trees, because it would be partially hidden by the existing houses on Friars Close, and because of the small-scale of proposed development it would not have a harmful effect on the setting of the town. The access is about 4 m wide, with clear sight from one end to the other, and would be suitable as an access-way for a low density development of up to five houses. Vehicle access to Friars Close is via Croft Road and via Church Street and Prince George Street. The first and last roads, whilst narrow, are one-way and thus able to accommodate any increase in traffic to and from the site which would not be large. The proximity to the town centre would most likely mean fewer car journeys to shops and services not adding in any significant way to the congestion in the town. There are a number of semi-mature trees on the site but these are not protected by Tree Preservation Order. It would be possible to sensitively develop the site whilst retaining many of the trees and create an attractive development. There is a wood to the west of the site and trees to the north and south which form strong and clear boundaries to the site and an attractive backcloth for development. A low density development would also provide opportunities for new tree planting in keeping with the setting. This part of Cheadle is naturally hilly and characterised by narrow roads and houses on the slopes. Houses on this site would be in character with the area and whilst the site slopes to the east it is open to the south and it would be possible to design the houses to take advantage of this. My clients request that this site is removed from	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary, comment number PO334.

Question 24 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the Green Belt and included in the Town Development Boundary to enable its residential development.	
PO478	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	Object	The boundary excludes site CH093 which is a deliverable housing site. It is currently in the Green Belt and representations were made about removing this designation last year. Greater weight should have been given to those representations given the Council's strategy for Cheadle and the lack of alternative suitable sites to bring forward development quickly. The site should be taken out of the green belt and be allocated for housing with the development boundary adjusted accordingly.	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary comment number PO479.
PO798	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO1009	Mrs Laura Cartlidge				Object	It is entirely inappropriate to be consulting on proposals in respect of Cheadle when; a) 'this consultation does not include details of proposed policies that will be included in the Local Plan' (paragraph 1.4). b) 'a transport study (WILL be completed) relating to the cumulative impact of development in the vicinity of Cheadle and the A50 (paragraph 1.16). 'The study WILL explore the case and feasibility of a bypass to the west of the town' (paragraph 3.31). c) 'an infrastructure delivery plan IS BEING PREPARED' (paragraph 3.27) In short the public is being consulted on spatial matters in a significant research and policy vacuum. We would add that it seems equally inappropriate to plan consultation on Local Plan Policies in the peak holiday months of July and August.	Some evidence base documents were still in progress prior to the Preferred Options and Boundaries consultation. There will be an opportunity to comment on the draft policies, the transport study at the next consultation stage.
PO6880	Unknown	Stoddards Ltd	Mr G Willard		General comment	None at this stage but reserve the right to comment later.	Comment noted.
PO6933	Mr M Bullock		Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Object	Following from the comments above, we would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in Cheadle and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development on part of the land in our client's ownership at Park Lane. Our previous representations have included submission of the following: A report in response to the SHLAA setting out the proposed development of our client's site and associated justification (see Enclosure 1); A diagram (Enclosure 2) showing the site's proximity and accessibility to Cheadle High Street and other facilities nearby including the nearest bus stops and supermarkets (all within walking distance); A further diagram (Enclosure 3) showing the site's relationship to a large number of buildings in the vicinity, which highlights the site's proximity to existing built development and confirms that the northern half of the site is an infill plot amongst this existing development; An indicative site plan and elevation (Enclosure 4) - featuring an access designed by highway consultants (SCP Transport) - to demonstrate that safe and suitable vehicular access onto the site could be achieved and showing the development of five detached single storey dwellings (with accommodation in the roofspace) on the front (north) part of the site, reflecting the building line of the existing residential properties on both sides of our client's site and demonstrating that a suitable housing layout of an appropriate density and character for the area could be provided on site taking other relevant factors into account. In response to the previous round of consultation, the Council published an Options Site Assessment, which forms part of the supporting documents to the current consultation. We would like to make the following comments in response to the content of the assessment of site CH165: 1. The assessment of site CH165 is	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary comment number PO6934.

Question 24 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						based on the development of circa 26 dwellings, therefore no account has been taken of our previous representations that promote the development of circa 5 dwellings on the northern part of the site only. We would urge the LPA to reconsider the site on this basis. 2. Similarly, reference is made to the Green Belt Review concluding that the site makes a significant contribution and should not be considered for release, however it is considered that the impact would not be significant when considering the development of circa 5 single storey dwellings on the northern part of the site only - which is at lower level than the more prominent higher ground to the south - and the infill nature of the site (with existing dwellings to both sides). The combination of the topography of the lower part of the site and provision of dormer bungalows that would blend into and complement the existing dwellings to both sides of the site would limit the impact of the site's development on the Green Belt. 3. We welcome and support the acknowledgment that the site's accessibility to services, facilities and areas of existing employment is likely to have a positive effect. 4. Reference is made to the site's development having a significant negative effect as a result of it comprising greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land. However, there is a good supply of grade 3 land in the vicinity and furthermore the site has severely limited potential for agricultural purposes as a result of its limited size and the proximity of existing dwellings to both sides (east and west). 5. With regard to access, reference is made to SCC Highways commenting that Park Lane is narrow and unmade and would need to be widened and improved to provide access to this site. However the road already provides access to a number of residential properties - including some further west than our client's land - and was deemed a suitable access to serve other uses nearby including the adjoining cemetery (which we understand has or will be doubled in size without such concerns being raised about the use of Park Lane to provide access to it). Furthermore we would also draw your attention to the section of our original SHLAA representations (Enclosure 1), which provide information on the low number of vehicle movements that would be generated by the development of circa five dwellings on the northern part of the site. 6. Further to the two points above, it is considered that traffic associated with residential development of the site would be more acceptable on Park Lane and the local highway network in general than the frequent use of larger vehicles associated with any future use of the site for agricultural purposes. With all the merits of the site in mind we would urge the LPA to re-consider the potential allocation of the front/northern part of our client's land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development along with associated revisions to the town and Green Belt boundary on the edge of Cheadle to accommodate this. The site is being promoted by a willing landowner and it is considered that the proposed development of five detached dwellings on the subject site is technically deliverable. Given the location and characteristics of the site and the availability of local services/utilities/infrastructure residential development of this site is economically viable and therefore achievable. Whilst the site is located within the Green Belt, we consider that additional sites are required to meet the housing needs of Cheadle and the district as a whole, particularly given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and other infill or windfall sites within the existing settlement boundary are severely limited. The release of land from the Green Belt is now further justified through an increase in the housing requirement, and as	

Question 24 – Do you have any comments on the proposed town boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						demonstrated in this submission, and other submissions made by Knights to date regarding the land at Park Lane, the release of the northern part of this site from the Green Belt is considered to be justified, effective, and would be consistent with national policy. I trust that this letter is clear in expressing our views regarding potential revisions to the Local Plan to incorporate the allocation of land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development.	
PO7051		Danbank Developments Ltd	Richard Barton	HOW Planning LLP	General comment	Danbank Developments consider that the proposed Cheadle development boundary is suitable and appropriate to deliver the identified quantum of development identified within the adopted Core Strategy. Danbank Developments would, however, reiterate that the identified amount of development is a minimum requirement and should not be regarded as a ceiling.	Support noted.
PO6812			Mr G Willard		Object	Yes. The town boundary fails to provide for small scale housing sites that could be suitable for small scale local builders or for self-builders. The attached plan shows a relatively small area of land that is in limited ownership and which is free from any legal or technical encumbrance preventing development. The site lies to the South (and to the town side) of site CH165 which is considered not to be suitable for development. The character of this land is sloping and it is in use as a paddock, garden land or as urban scrub. Its character and nature is markedly different from the land that lies to the North and West of the site (including site CH165) as will be borne out by a site visit by officers.	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary comment number PO6843.
PO7032	J W Poultney		Mr Gregory Gray	Gregory Gray Associates	Object	Our Client objects to the exclusion of Harewood Grange Farm from the Cheadle Town Boundary. The site would comprise a logical extension in association with other land uses in the area that is otherwise unconstrained and plays no meaningful Green Belt function (a separate representation is made to Q26) and will provide an appropriate and logical area for sustainable settlement growth over the Plan period, avoiding the need for further Green Belt review.	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary comment number PO7035.

Question 25 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2569	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Planning Manager Sport England			All	Object	I note some of the open space designations are formal sports facilities (which is supported) but it is very important that all sports sites are captured otherwise those excluded will have lesser protection. I note that the Football Ground off Orchard Court/Grace Street for example is not designated whereas the cricket club site just to the north is - why? I also note that the playing fields associated with the secondary school are not designated – should they not be? It will be important to clarify what is designated and why (or why not) and to ensure all playing fields are clearly protected (as it is a defined function/use of open space), whether it is in Council ownership or not (Birchall Playing Fields appears to be included?) so there is a consistent level of protect for all open space, whatever its use. This principle applies across ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS.	The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.
PO2864	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			All	Object	In relation to the areas of Open Space identified throughout the site options document it is noted that all school playing fields have been categorised as open space, some in their entirety and others appear to only include certain parts. There is no definition in the plan as to what 'Open Space' constitutes or whether it needs to be accessible to the general public. As the Plan progresses it is unclear what policy restrictions may be imposed to such land. We therefore reserve out position on 'Open Space' at school fields and suggest that further discussion is required on whether the identification of school playing fields as 'Open Space' is required given the protection afforded to playing fields already through National Planning legislation and school premises legislation?	- Not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. - See response to PO2569.
PO1290	Justin Milward	Lead Government Affairs Officer (Local), Woodland Trust			All sites	Support	Support provision of Open Space in the Local Plan. (Further detail in attached comments).	Support noted.
PO621	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				All	Object	The majority of the 'public' open spaces on the map are in fact private property and belong to the schools. The map gives the impression that the public open spaces are evenly balanced across the town when this is not the case. If the housing is built in the south most people will be a considerable distance from any public open space. This needs to be rectified on the map because it is misinforming the public.	See response to PO2864 regarding public open space.
PO819	Mr Alan Donaldson				All to south west of Tean Road	General comment	The existing open spaces marked in green, to the west of the Tean Road are playing fields or hospital grounds or church yard which are not accessible to the general public. Therefore should the proposed developments take place consideration must be given for open public access areas to be included within any development ie CH085D. This area is predominately bungalows occupied by elderly who would benefit from access to open space within a short walk, which the farmer currently allows.	- See response to PO2864 regarding public open space. - Public access within sites and links to wider green infrastructure will need to be considered within the layout and design of each site.

Question 25 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1505 PO1497 PO1512 PO1517 PO7080	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor M Ellicock				CH001	General comment	Looking at the map designations, the areas designated as Visual Open Space are few but the land designated for development is considerable. Due to the fact that the proposed development of CH001 would have the maximum adverse impact upon existing residents, given that it is bordered by more existing residents than most of the other proposed sites, plus those residents in the adjoining road structure, it would make more sense to for this to be Visual Open Space instead of being used to connect the existing housing to form one of the largest blocks of housing in Cheadle.	- This area has already been identified as an appropriate area for housing in the adopted Core Strategy and is well related to the existing settlement. - New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the creation of new links.
PO1010	Mrs Laura Cartlidge				CH085a	Object	It is erroneous to classify large areas of school and college playing fields in the south west of the town as 'Public Open Space'. While some is in 'public' ownership, there is no de facto access on a casual basis for members of the general public. It is to provide a misleading picture of public open space availability in this part of the town.	See response to PO2864 regarding public open space.
PO1237	Mr & Mrs S & A Baker				Cheadle	Object	Tonight's meeting has been very useful there were points however on the maps that were incorrect. Public open spaces, bright green in colour were all schools! School playing fields are private. In the day there are child safety issues and at night locked due to vandalism?	See response to PO2864 regarding public open space.
PO108	Mr Andrew Baker				Cheadle west	Object	We live on Paragon Close in Cheadle which runs parallel to the proposed development site. Is the council aware that there is a significant drop of between 6 to 8 feet onto the field which is a known flood plain? The fields identified are used continually by families, dog walkers and runners. Building on this area would severely limit the public's access to open and green areas, and with the arrival of potentially 1000 cars the pollution levels would rise significantly. The primary school that has been identified to be built is not necessary as the present schools are not full. However is the council aware that the only two high schools are full and are turning prospective pupils away? It must be noted that the areas on the map designated by the council as public open spaces were actually school playing fields. So, in fact the "green" areas are neither public nor open. This is misleading information.	- See response to PO2864 regarding public open space. - Public access within sites and links to wider green infrastructure will need to be considered within the layout and design of each site. - The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability, however a small section located to the west of the site is located in Flood Zone 3 – High probability. This could be incorporated open space. Any application would be accompanied by an FRA which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that neighbouring areas are not affected. - Based on the anticipated number of new dwellings in Cheadle, Staffordshire County Council have indicated that a new Primary School will be required.
PO799	Ms Alison Conybeare				General	General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO7514	Mr Philip Walton				General comments	Object	Cheadle There are no Public Areas on this side of Cheadle (west). Those 'green' areas depicted on the map are school playing fields to which the public has no access. Cheadle does not have much open space within the town, and what we do have needs improvement. The plans do not seem to indicate new open spaces, play areas etc to accommodate the new families.	- See response to PO2864 regarding public open space. - New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping.

Question 25 – Do you have any comments on the proposed visual and public open spaces for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO167	Mrs E Baskeyfield				Multiple	Object	Many of the 'public open spaces' highlighted on the map are not actually public open spaces. Land belonging to the Moorlands Sixth Form College, Painsley Catholic College, The Cheadle Academy and Cheadle County Primary have all been highlighted. These are in fact private property and not open to the public. By highlighting these as public open spaces it appears that the houseing provision proposed for the southern areas of the town is balanced by the open spaces provided when this is not the case. New housing in the south would be some distance from any public open space.	• See response to PO2864 regarding areas of public open space. • See response to PO7514 regarding need for new open space in Cheadle West.
PO391	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				South west	Object	The 3 public open spaces highlighted on the above map for the south west are in actual fact school fields which we, the public, do not have access to. This map is very misleading. If you take out the school fields then this area of cheadle has little public open space and what it does have you are proposing to build on.	• See response to PO2864 regarding areas of public open space. • See response to PO7514 regarding need for new open space in Cheadle West.

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO80	Mrs Desiree Billington				General comment	We used to live and work in the heart of the West Midlands (the Black Country). A large urban sprawl and often very congested. After taking early retirement, in 2012, we chose to live in Cheadle, it being a very pleasant semi rural market town. Cheadle has the correct amount of properties and population to make it a very nice and friendly place to live. It does have its problems, it can get very congested at school times and morning and evening rush hour. In particular in the town centre and Tean Road. Tape Street is also a big problem having 3 sets of pedestrian crossing lights which causes tailbacks at certain times. No one wants any more building in Cheadle. There is not enough infrastructure to cope with an extra influx of people. Roads certainly cannot cope with more traffic. On a personal note, we do not want any more houses near to our property as this will cause noise pollution, obstruct our current views, invade our privacy, cause havoc to wildlife and maybe even cause environmental problems such as flooding, ie: houses being built on farm land which currently has good rain water drainage. Cheadle council need to think seriously about the upset and problems they are like to cause if they go ahead with a ludicrous idea of excess building anywhere in the town.	- The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) identifies the likely impacts of the housing and employment Preferred Options sites on the surrounding highway network. By 2031 the study predicts queuing and delays in certain locations, in part due to 17 years of potential traffic growth which is compounded by the additional trips generated by new housing and employment. There is limited scope to change junction characteristics to improve network capacity within the Town Centre due to its historically confined road structure. The study recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. Mitigation measures include junction and lane improvements, new sites having good access to public transport provision, measures to encourage walking and cycling to reduce short trips, improved HGV signage and new parking bays along High Street. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. - The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process.
PO99	Mrs Karen Wilshaw		Mrs Karen Wilshaw		Object	This is an opportunity to consider the inclusion of small parcels of land close to the centre of Cheadle for building development which are currently in the green belt. I have previously proposed a site at the rear of our property (CH016b). Currently the green belt runs through the middle of this site - the lower part has already been developed for over 30 years and there are houses on three sides of the remaining small parcel of land - one currently under construction. Revising the green belt boundary to include this land would create the opportunity for a modest building development to enhance the diversity of housing close to the centre of the town. Including such parcels of land such as this site would not undermine the main purpose of the green belt - protecting from urban sprawl - as it is already surrounded by housing.	- The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. - The Green Belt review considers this parcel (S13) is a relatively remote rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							- Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution • Although the site (CH016b) is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size 6 dwellings, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt. • Land is identified as important landscape setting to settlement.
PO334	Mr & Mrs Harrison	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Object	LAND TO THE WEST OF FRIAR'S CLOSE, CHEADLE . On behalf of my clients, the site owners, Mr & Mrs Harrison I object to the omission of site from the proposed residential allocations. My clients put forward the site in a letter dated 18 September 2015 as part of the Site Options consultations. A location plan was submitted with the letter. The reasons for objecting to the exclusion of the site are: Although the site is outside the proposed Town Boundary and in the Green Belt it is within walking distance of the town centre, shops and services and is immediately available for development. Access to the site is via an existing access from Friar's Close and this was shown on the previously submitted plan. Whilst the site is in the Green Belt and below the threshold for display in the Local Plan development for housing would make beneficial use of the land which is currently mown grass and not in agricultural use and because of its location away from farms is not suitable for agricultural use. It is immediately adjacent to modern housing and development would not have a significant effect on the wider landscape character. The woodland to the west would provide a clear, recognisable and permanent boundary to the site and the Green Belt. Development on this site would not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt (preventing sprawl, encroachment, merger, protecting the setting of historic towns and urban regeneration). Whilst the land would be developed the site is contained by the surrounding properties and woodland. Because of the number of houses proposed the site is not specifically assessed in the Council's Green Belt Review however in the Review the site is in the S13 sub-zone where its contribution to preventing sprawl, merger, and assisting urban regeneration is considered to be limited. The Review considers that the zone does make a contribution towards the setting of the town and preventing encroachment. However, it is contended that because of the site's location between houses and woodland development would not lead to encroachment as it would involve only a small part of the sub-zone from which it is visually	• The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. • green Belt review considers this parcel (S13) is a relatively remote rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution • Although the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt. • Land is identified as important landscape setting to settlement.

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						separated by the woodland. Further, because of its setting against a backdrop of trees, because it would be partially hidden by the existing houses on Friars Close, and because of the small-scale of proposed development it would not have a harmful effect on the setting of the town. The access is about 4 m wide, with clear sight from one end to the other, and would be suitable as an access-way for a low density development of up to five houses. Vehicle access to Friars Close is via Croft Road and via Church Street and Prince George Street. The first and last roads, whilst narrow, are one-way and thus able to accommodate any increase in traffic to and from the site which would not be large. The proximity to the town centre would most likely mean fewer car journeys to shops and services not adding in any significant way to the congestion in the town.	
PO1091	Mr P Beesley				Object	Access into this site would add to an already busy stretch. Pedestrians already have to walk up the road to cross the bridge . This needs to be sorted as well crossroads at the Huntsman which is already an accident black spot.	The Highway Authority confirms that site CH128 could provide access to sites CH093 and CH085a – d. A smaller amount of dwellings could be served off the existing highways network.

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO479	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	Object	The retention of site CH093 within the green belt is not justified on functional or visual grounds. It meets none of the purposes for having this designation set out in paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given the urgent need for the Council to find deliverable housing sites in the District and in Cheadle in particular this land should be taken out of the green belt and should be shown as a preferred residential site as the Plan moves forward.	- CH093 was considered as part of the Green Belt Review Study and the overall impact of development on the purposes of the Green Belt was considered to be moderate. - Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and although concludes that it could be considered for release, exceptional circumstances would need to be justified. - The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study considers the site to be of high landscape sensitivity. Some screening is provided by woodland to the south, particularly when viewed from the A522, however the land rises up from the woodland and visual prominence increases. The site does not fit well within existing settlement pattern and development of the site would adversely affect the existing settlement pattern and edge, and encroach on countryside. - It is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.
PO800	Ms Alison Conybeare				Object	The green belt must not be altered for development. It is vital to maintain in order to prevent urban spread.	The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review.
PO1069	Mr John Bevan	Cheadle Unite			General comment	Move or use the Green Belt to allow a new Link rd between JCB (built in green belt), Leek Rd and Brookhouses, Cheadle & on to Draycott & A50 to remove congestion in Cheadle town.	- The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential for a bypass-type road and concludes that the cost to construct a new road would be very high and unlikely to offset any cost benefits of the scheme. - Green Belt review considers this parcel (S13) is a

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							relatively remote rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution
PO818	Mr Alan Donaldson				Object	We strongly object to the development of a large section of green belt land to the west of Cheadle.	The development of land to the west of Cheadle would not require a substantial Green Belt adjustment as the majority of this area has already been taken out of the Green Belt.
PO1506 PO1498 PO1513 PO1529 PO7083	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor M Ellicock				General comment	CH168 is listed on the SHLAA document with a potential for 450 properties. This area is arguably the least contentious in terms of its location, causing least impact upon the existing population as a whole and could be served from the existing JCB factory roundabout. But it's on green belt land. So are the JCB Factories. Although been on green belt hasn't stopped it from been listed on the SHLAA document. In nearly thirty years of travelling past this site, I have yet to see anyone using it. The JCB factories are on green belt land and they have been developed responsibly. Few would argue that the JCB factories are of enormous benefit to Cheadle and are an example of how such land can be a benefit to the town as a whole. This could save many other sites in our area like CH001 that is widely used for recreational purposes. It would have no impact on the existing population or road structure and maintain the "open space" character of Cheadle that is so important to this town. It is reported that 60% of Cheadle residents commute out for employment, CH168 has direct access to the A522, the main roadway in and out of the town. The Large Site Assessment Forms states; "The Agent states there are no ownership constraints Sept 2012" and "Development would be economically viable taking into account all likely costs and planning obligations associated with the site."	• The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. • green Belt review considers this parcel (S14) is a largely rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south and east. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution • Although the site (CH168) is in close proximity to JCB which is a major employer in the town, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location to accommodate new housing. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.
PO6934	Mr M Bullock		Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Object	Following from the comments above, we would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in Cheadle and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development on part of the land in our client's ownership at Park	• CH168 was considered as part of the Green Belt Review Study and the overall impact of development on the purposes of the Green Belt was considered to be significant. - Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Lane. Our previous representations have included submission of the following: A report in response to the SHLAA setting out the proposed development of our client's site and associated justification (see Enclosure 1); A diagram (Enclosure 2) showing the site's proximity and accessibility to Cheadle High Street and other facilities nearby including the nearest bus stops and supermarkets (all within walking distance); A further diagram (Enclosure 3) showing the site's relationship to a large number of buildings in the vicinity, which highlights the site's proximity to existing built development and confirms that the northern half of the site is an infill plot amongst this existing development; An indicative site plan and elevation (Enclosure 4) - featuring an access designed by highway consultants (SCP Transport) - to demonstrate that safe and suitable vehicular access onto the site could be achieved and showing the development of five detached single storey dwellings (with accommodation in the roofspace) on the front (north) part of the site, reflecting the building line of the existing residential properties on both sides of our client's site and demonstrating that a suitable housing layout of an appropriate density and character for the area could be provided on site taking other relevant factors into account. In response to the previous round of consultation, the Council published an Options Site Assessment, which forms part of the supporting documents to the current consultation. We would like to make the following comments in response to the content of the assessment of site CH165: 1. The assessment of site CH165 is based on the development of circa 26 dwellings, therefore no account has been taken of our previous representations that promote the development of circa 5 dwellings on the northern part of the site only. We would urge the LPA to reconsider the site on this basis. 2. Similarly, reference is made to the Green Belt Review concluding that the site makes a significant contribution and should not be considered for release, however it is considered that the impact would not be significant when considering the development of circa 5 single storey dwellings on the northern part of the site only - which is at lower level than the more prominent higher ground to the south - and the infill nature of the site (with existing dwellings to both sides). The combination of the topography of the lower part of the site and provision of dormer bungalows that would blend into and complement the existing dwellings to both sides of the site would limit the impact of the site's development on the Green Belt. 3. We welcome and support the acknowledgment that the site's accessibility to services, facilities and areas of existing employment is likely to have a positive effect. 4. Reference is made to the site's development having a significant negative effect as a result of it comprising greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land. However, there is	- Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – significant contribution - Setting of towns – significant contribution • The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. • Although the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and development would be of a much more limited scale (5 dwellings compared to an indicative 26 dwellings) the Green Belt review considers that development in this location would create an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside on rising land. It is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt. • Land is identified as important landscape setting to settlement in the LCA.

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						a good supply of grade 3 land in the vicinity and furthermore the site has severely limited potential for agricultural purposes as a result of its limited size and the proximity of existing dwellings to both sides (east and west). 5. With regard to access, reference is made to SCC Highways commenting that Park Lane is narrow and unmade and would need to be widened and improved to provide access to this site. However the road already provides access to a number of residential properties - including some further west than our client's land - and was deemed a suitable access to serve other uses nearby including the adjoining cemetery (which we understand has or will be doubled in size without such concerns being raised about the use of Park Lane to provide access to it). Furthermore we would also draw your attention to the section of our original SHLAA representations (Enclosure 1), which provide information on the low number of vehicle movements that would be generated by the development of circa five dwellings on the northern part of the site. 6. Further to the two points above, it is considered that traffic associated with residential development of the site would be more acceptable on Park Lane and the local highway network in general than the frequent use of larger vehicles associated with any future use of the site for agricultural purposes. With all the merits of the site in mind we would urge the LPA to re-consider the potential allocation of the front/northern part of our client's land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development along with associated revisions to the town and Green Belt boundary on the edge of Cheadle to accommodate this. The site is being promoted by a willing landowner and it is considered that the proposed development of five detached dwellings on the subject site is technically deliverable. Given the location and characteristics of the site and the availability of local services/utilities/infrastructure residential development of this site is economically viable and therefore achievable. Whilst the site is located within the Green Belt, we consider that additional sites are required to meet the housing needs of Cheadle and the district as a whole, particularly given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and other infill or windfall sites within the existing settlement boundary are severely limited. The release of land from the Green Belt is now further justified through an increase in the housing requirement, and as demonstrated in this submission, and other submissions made by Knights to date regarding the land at Park Lane, the release of the northern part of this site from the Green Belt is considered to be justified, effective, and would be consistent with national policy. I trust that this letter is clear in expressing our views regarding potential revisions to the Local Plan to incorporate the allocation of land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development.	

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7035	J W Poultney		Mr Gregory Gray	Gregory Gray Associates	Object	Our Client objects to the inclusion of Harewood Grange Farm in the Green Belt and the exclusion from the Cheadle Town Boundary (a separate representation is made to Q24). The site would comprise a logical settlement extension in association with other land uses in the area that is otherwise unconstrained and plays no meaningful Green Belt function and will provide an appropriate and logical area for sustainable settlement growth over the Plan period, avoiding the need for further Green Belt review.	- The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. - green Belt review considers this parcel (S13) is a relatively remote rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution - Although Harewood Grange Farm is in close proximity to JCB which is a major employer in the town, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary and town development boundary in this location to accommodate new housing. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt. - Land is identified as important landscape setting to settlement in the LCA.
PO6843			Mr G Willard		Object	The NPPG says the following with regard to defining Green Belt boundaries: When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: • ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development; • not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; • where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; • make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development; • satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and • define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Having regard to the above the following comments are relevant: The land identified within this submission is wholly sustainable. It the closest developable land to the town centre with other land	- The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. - green Belt review considers this parcel (S13) is a relatively remote rural parcel which forms part of the eastern edge of the Green Belt. The parcel is vulnerable to urbanisation, given its relative proximity to Cheadle immediately to the south. - Check unrestricted sprawl – limited contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution - Although the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and of a relatively small size 10

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						being either too steep to build on or constrained by open space designation or forming part of Cheadle Park. Such accessible land cannot be disregarded in policy formulation especially since sustainability is the golden thread which should run thru policy making. There is no need to keep this land open. It is surrounded to the North, East and West by residential development. The development of the land for housing would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon local openness. Whilst the site could be identified as safeguarded land this would not address the need and requirement to provide land within plans (para 159 of the NPPF) that is suitable for self-build housing. The proposal will provide a clear and defensible boundary in the form of an ancient hedgerow running along the length of the site. This replaces an existing Green Belt plan boundary which cuts across garden land and an open paddock and which is not so clearly defined or easy to defend in the future. It is considered that the plan ought to be amended with a revised Green Belt boundary that runs to the West of Nursery Close (see attached plan). This would allow for limited infilling to the east of this line with self-build or custom housing. The council are asked at this stage to pause reflect and consider what if any policy provision they have or are likely to have for self build housing or small sites suitable for local builders. Park Lane is a part of Cheadle which comprises wholly or mainly of custom build houses and the small extension of the Green Belt boundary in this area will serve to continue that provision and be in character with the nature of the area, whilst providing a logical and defensible new Green Belt boundary as shown on the attached plan (Appendix B). The proposed site ought to be measured against the purposes of the Green Belt before it is considered for release from the Green Belt. In these respects the following can be said: Preventing Sprawl - The site already has residential development to the North, East and West of it. It would not advance beyond this existing build line and consequently the allocation for housing would have a limited contribution to Urban Sprawl. Maintain separation - The site is to the North of Cheadle with many clear miles of open Green Belt land between the site and Stoke-on-Trent. It would have a very limited contribution to and would not harm separation. Prevent encroachment - The site is bounded by a mature and well defined hedge boundary to the West of it which would contain the site to within the built up area. It would have a limited impact upon encroachment. Preserve setting - The site is modest in scale and protected from wider view because of the nature of the gently sloping terrain. Self build housing forms on the site would accord with that already completed on the adjacent land and the development would have at worst only a modest and acceptable impact upon protecting the setting of the town. Overall impact upon purpose of the Green Belt	dwellings, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this location. There are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt. Land is identified as important landscape setting to settlement.

Question 26 – Do you have any comments on the Green Belt boundary for Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						- The proposed site has a well defined and clear boundary (see appendix B) and it would provide a long term and defensible settlement and Green Belt boundary to the town which would be defensible whilst at the same time allowing for organic or natural infill on a site which is within close walking distance of the town centre and is sustainable. The Green Belt boundary ought to be changed in this area and the land identified released for niche residential development of up to 10 dwellings. Note...the site and boundary identified within this submission has not been especially identified or considered by the Green Belt review which appears to have not considered any land to the South of site CH165. It cannot therefore be said that the proposal do or do not accord with the findings within the Green Belt review.	

Question 27 – Do you have any comments on the proposed employment sites in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
PO392	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Broad Area EM1	General comment	Poor quality access road to this area. Why not expand by JCB in the north with better access roads.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site for employment purposes; however has indicated that a TA would be required and improvements would be likely along New Haden Road. If these can be resolved to an acceptable standard then development could take place. JCB Leek Road premises lies in the Green Belt. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence in progressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO820	Mr Alan Donaldson				Broad Area EM1	General comment	The two areas identified as potential employment sites do not justify the amount of housing development that is proposed for the town.	Councils must firstly assess their OANs (development requirements) for future land uses such as housing and employment land; and then meet these requirements, to have a sound Local Plan in place. An assessment of employment land requirements and housing requirements by NLP in February 2017 concluded that 13ha to 27ha of employment land, and 320 homes/year were required to meet the needs of the district 2014-2031. To dovetail with the housing requirement it was recommended to and agreed by Council Assembly on 08/03/17 that 27ha of employment land should be provided 2014-2031. The Council's adopted Core Strategy Policy SS3 sets out how District housing and employment requirements be 'split' across the District, including for Cheadle. This forms the basis of the housing and employment land provision for the town.
PO8981	Mrs L J Hurst				Broad Area EM1	Object	This would be one industrial site too many on this country lane. Also footpath No 17 edges this area and needs protecting.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site for employment purposes; however has indicated that a TA would be required and improvements would be likely along New Haden Road. If these can be resolved to an acceptable standard then development could take place.

Question 27 – Do you have any comments on the proposed employment sites in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
								Development proposals affecting the routes of recognised public rights of way would need to make allowance for them.
PO7516	Mr Philip Walton				Broad Area EM1	Object	Employment plans in Cheadle South on the Green Belt are totally unacceptable.	Note that both of the preferred options employment sites Cheadle EM1 and Cheadle EM2 lie within the town development boundary; and do not fall within Green belt.
PO388	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Broad Area EM2	Object	The employment land allocation for Cheadle is accessed by Draycott Cross road which is not suitable for heavy traffic and HGV's. It is steep, windey and narrow in places. Why has there not been further development in the north area where JCB have already erected 2 factories and improved the road to make access out of Cheadle More streamlined. This would seem to make more sense and have less impact on town traffic.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site for employment purposes; advising it is acceptable subject to Transport Assessment if access can be achieved. JCB Leek Road premises lies in the Green Belt. Whilst Councils can allocate within the Green Belt National Planning policy is clear that this requires exceptional circumstances to justify (as compared to non-Green Belt). The Council recently completed a Green Belt Review which assessed the suitability for retention of all areas of Green Belt in the District, against the five Green Belt 'purposes' set out in the NPPF. This will be used by the Council alongside other evidence in progressing its Local Plan. The NPPF also allows for consideration of development proposals that would represent 'limited infilling', or in some cases redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt.
PO803	Ms Alison Conybeare				Broad Area EM2	Object	The main access road to this site struggles to cope with the current industrial traffic. Additional traffic would be difficult to accomodate.	The Council consults with SCC Highways during Local Plan preparation. SCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site for employment purposes; advising it is acceptable subject to Transport Assessment if access can be achieved.
PO7518	Mr Philip Walton				Broad Area EM2	Object	Employment plans in Cheadle South on the Green Belt are totally unacceptable.	Note that both of the preferred options employment sites Cheadle EM1 and Cheadle EM2 lie within the town development boundary; and do not fall within Green belt.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Broad Area 1 – CH001								
PO6906		Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	Broad Area 1 - CH001	Support	Core Strategy Broad Area 1 – CH001, Cheadle This site was allocated in the Council’s 2014 Core Strategy as the principal strategic residential land for Cheadle. Mosaic made a response to the July 2015 early Site Allocations consultation indicating that this site is indeed sustainable as part of the growth of Cheadle and deliverable within the Council’s plan period. Though this position remains unchanged and the site is already allocated for around 240 dwellings, there have been a number of responses to the site as part of the previous consultation, which does seem at odds with the status of the allocation. To avoid this confusion, it would be beneficial for future consultation documents to present the site differently, making a clear distinction between what is already allocated and which sites are being proposed for allocation by the Council. Whilst it is accepted that the site is already allocated, the following observations are made in response to the previous consultation comments: Natural England has commented in respect of a requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). It is noted that as part of the evidence base supporting the 2014 Core Strategy, the Council submitted evidence of landscape character and impact which was sufficient for the site to be allocated. In addition, RPS submitted evidence to the Council in May 2014 demonstrating how the site could be delivered. This evidence included an assessment of visual impact as part of an overall strategy for development. Comments were received from the Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust relating to the setting of Woodhead Heart. The comments pertain to the siting and layout of the allocation, set against Woodhead Heart, an undesignated heritage site. Whilst this site has no formal designated status, it is considered that future development on this site would respond to the local setting in an appropriate and sympathetic way. The Council’s own comments from the Sustainability Appraisal offer largely supportive comments on the sustainability of the site. There are however negative comments linked to the Grade 3 Agricultural Land Classification of the site. The Council has not defined whether this is Grade 3a or Grade 3b land, taking a broad brush approach to the assessment. In either case, Grade 3a represents only marginally better quality land than 3b, which is not recognised as ‘best and most versatile’, along with categories Grade 1 and Grade 2. It appears that the assessment of significant negative effect is, in this regard, an inappropriate conclusion.	- Developer support for the site is noted. - This site is identified in the adopted Core Strategy as being suitable for housing, however, Policy SS5c states that sites will be identified and phased through the Site Allocations DPD. It is not therefore allocated at this stage. - The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) has considered the site and suggests some site-specific landscape mitigation measures. There are not considered to be any heritage impacts associated with the development of the site. - The land is Agricultural Class 3 Good to Moderate. Data supplied by Natural England indicates that there is a moderate likelihood that the land is best and most versatile land i.e. Class 3a. The Sustainability Appraisal will be updated to reflect the most up to date evidence base.
PO399	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Support	Makes sense to propose housing development near the new school good access roads more balanced developemnt for Cheadle town.	Support noted.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1382	Mrs J Schmidt				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	I wish to add my complaints to the proposed development of 400+ houses + a school in front of the of the Park Home development of Broad Hayes Park down to the Oakamoor – Cheadle Road bordering hales Hall + Caravan plus Leisure Park. We urge the responsibilities of the council under the human rights act in particular protocol 1 article 1 which states that a person has the right to a peaceful enjoyment which include the home + other land. We believe that article 8 of the Human Rights act states that a person has substantive right to respect for their private + family life. In the case of Britain V SOS the courts reappraised the purposes of the law + concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of article 8. Private + Family life therefore encompass not only the homes but also the surroundings. As the occupants of Broad Hayes Park Homes are mostly retained in the over 70's group. They should be able to enjoy their retirement in peace + quiet without extra traffic ect that the Cheadle Roads cannot cope with the already plus all the noise from building 400 + houses + roads would be detrimental to their lives. As I was thinking of retiring to that area myself I feel I should send you my letter of complaint.	- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. There are not enough brownfield sites within Cheadle to accommodate the level of housing it needs. - Amenity issues and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received, and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. - Traffic – The highways authority have advised that appropriately designed accesses would accommodate 240 + 80 + School. This number would require at least 2 accesses. A new access off Froghall Road would be preferable with secondary accesses through the existing estate. If the 80 units were separate, they could be served off a single point. Pedestrian connections should be made to the residential area to the north.
PO1507 PO1499 PO1514 PO1530	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	Objection to development of CH001 Adoption of this site directly affects more existing residents than any other of the proposed sites and has a history of being refused planning when local councils had control of their own areas. The area known as CH001 has been widely used by residents that adjoining the site and residents living beyond its immediate vicinity on a daily basis for recreational purposes. It also worse SA score than some other sites in the area. Cheadle is one of the many areas in the country that does not have a housing crisis. It has been mentioned that 60% of Cheadle residents commute out for employment, it is hardly environmentally friendly to increase this percentage. At the time of writing there are nearly 80 properties for sale in Cheadle between the price range of £70,000 - £200,000 and more above this price range. In this area, all roads lead to Ness Grove. It seems that either no consideration has been given to the Ness Grove residents or residents in the surrounding feeder roads / proposed feeder roads, or it has been completely ignored. The field retains water, especially on the east side and can have a soggy feel when walking on it, especially after rainfall, significant pools of water are clearly visible. Sounds similar to water draining from a kitchen sink have been heard in the area of the old mineshaft after rainy spell. CH001 features a gentle slope controlling and slowing the eventual release of water into the adjoining brook. Increasing the hard impermeable surfaces of a development would accelerate water release into the brook, increasing the flood risk downstream, particularly in the Tay Close area where the brook passes under a low bridge. Nationwide, the intensity	- This area has already been identified as an appropriate area for housing in the adopted Core Strategy and is well related to the existing settlement. - Employment site options are also proposed in Cheadle to provide opportunities for local businesses and jobs. - The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) makes an allowance for empty properties / houses that are for sale. - The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. - There are former mineral workings on the site. The Coal Authority have confirmed that this would not prevent development from taking place. Investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development. - The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability, however a small section located to the east of the site is located in Flood Zone 3 – High probability. This could be incorporated open space. Any application would be accompanied by an FRA which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that neighbouring areas are not affected. - New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							of flood events has increased and impacted areas that have not previously been affected. Flood risk is becoming less predictable as our weather patterns are changing. If an area does experience a flood or is reassessed as a higher flood risk, then insurance premiums become unaffordable or unavailable. Flood risk can no longer be predicted. The term "unprecedented rainfall" is now redundant and is becoming the norm, as well publicised recent events nationwide would testify. From the Local Government Association website: "Urbanisation has reduced the ability of land to absorb rainfall through the introduction of hard, impermeable surfaces. This results in an increase in the volume and rate of surface run-off as less water infiltrates into the ground." You don't have to be an environmental genius to come up with that statement. When flooding occurs, particularly flash flooding, the risk of which would be greatly increased, what compensation is available to cover the increased insurance cost, if insurance is available at all. Would affected residents be left with the option of attempting to sue in order to recoup their increased costs, citing past development refusals as the basis for compensation. Who would take responsibility, developers or councils? Obviously Cheadle is not the Cotswolds but for many residents green space is readily accessible for recreational purposes, walking and jogging, generally adding to residents quality of life. Filling in every available green space is poor planning and town design, something that is reminiscent of decades past. Large concentrations of housing has long since been frowned upon and the balance of housing and green space in the Cheadle North East area is better than some other towns. The difference is that the Cotswolds is largely protected and the Prime Minister lives there. Further, consider the voting, consultation process. If it were based solely upon the designated area that the resident(s) lived closest to, then the planning refusals of the past concerning CH001 would remain but when residents are anxious to protect their own area of the environment elsewhere around Cheadle and can be organised or led into objecting to a collection of other identified sites whilst not commenting or objecting to another, then the nominated "sacrificial lamb" is out voted by some margin. Looking at the map designations, the areas designated as Visual Open Space are few but the land designated for development is considerable. Due to the fact that the proposed development of CH001 would have the maximum adverse impact upon existing residents, given that it is bordered by more existing residents than most of the other proposed sites, plus those residents in the adjoining road structure, it would make more sense to for this to be Visual Open Space instead of being used to connect the existing housing to form one of the largest blocks of housing in Cheadle.	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2808 PO3362 PO3622 PO3748	A Brattley Mr Harvey Cope Mr J Edwards Mr T Loving				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field Is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	- CH001 has already been identified as an appropriate area for housing in the adopted Core Strategy and is well related to the existing settlement. - See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132 and the Core Strategy examination. - See response to PO1382 regarding access and numbers of dwellings that could be served. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - The site is adjacent to the Cecilly Brook Local Nature Reserve and there is an isolated population of water voles (protected species) Natural England have advised that a buffer along the watercourse would be required. - The Thorley Drive planning permission can be taken into account as a housing commitment once the final decision notice has been issued. Housing commitments form part of the supply of new housing and will be deducted from the required provision for Cheadle. - Based on the anticipated number of new dwellings in Cheadle, Staffordshire County Council have indicated that a new Primary School will be required. The existing schools are located in the SW area of Cheadle, close to the town centre. There are benefits in locating a new school to the north of Cheadle to serve new and existing housing to the north of the town and could reduce school generated traffic in the town centre.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7463	Ms Linda Powell				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	Area CH001 Although within the town boundary, the over-development of this area, circa 240 houses, will generate an unacceptable volume of traffic, when taking into consideration traffic on the Oakamoor Road from JCB, and the MJS Transport depot which has now been given permission to expand their operations, resulting in more heavy goods vehicular traffic on Froghall Road. The Cheadle Town centre traffic survey of November 2015 omitted to include the Froghall Road junction to highlight its inherent problems. Public right of way crossing Area 1, which in accordance with National Legislation and ByeLaws should remain in place, which would mean any development would be in fragmented sections, with associated access problems. Historic evidence of coal extraction in this area. Old mine workings, 2 disused mine shafts and bell pits with associated waste products would make the stability of this area questionable. I can find no evidence that SMDC has carried out a comprehensive survey to assess the suitability of the land for building use, and until this is done the area must be rendered unsuitable for development. Part of the proposed Area 001 is considered to be a flooding risk. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley drive for 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension; accordingly, we are asking you to remove these sites from the plan and move the location of a potential new School to a more sensible, sustainable and central location.	- The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) identifies the likely impacts of the housing and employment Preferred Options sites on the surrounding highway network. By 2031 the study predicts queuing and delays in certain locations, in part due to 17 years of potential traffic growth which is compounded by the additional trips generated by new housing and employment. There is limited scope to change junction characteristics to improve network capacity within the Town Centre due to its historically confined road structure. The study recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. Mitigation measures include junction and lane improvements, new sites having good access to public transport provision, measures to encourage walking and cycling to reduce short trips, improved HGV signage and new parking bays along High Street. - See response to PO1507 regarding former mineral workings. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites. - See response to PO2808 regarding the Thorley Drive housing application. - See response to PO2808 regarding the location of the proposed new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7086	M Ellicock				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	Adoption of this site directly affects more existing residents than any other of the proposed sites and has a history of being refused planning when local councils had control of their own areas. The area known as CH001 has been widely used by residents that adjoin the site and residents living beyond its immediate vicinity on a daily basis for recreational purposes. It also worse SA score than some other sites in the area. Cheadle is one of the many areas in the country that does not have a housing crisis. It has been mentioned that 60% of Cheadle residents commute out for employment, it is hardly environmentally friendly to increase this percentage. At the time of writing there are nearly 80 properties for sale in Cheadle between the price range of £70,000 - £200,000 and more above this price range. In this area, all roads lead to Ness Grove. It seems that either no consideration has been given to the Ness Grove residents or residents in the surrounding feeder roads / proposed feeder roads, or it has been completely ignored. The field retains water, especially on the east side and can have a soggy feel when walking on it, especially after rainfall, significant pools of water are clearly visible. Sounds similar to water draining from a kitchen sink have been heard in the area of the old mineshaft after rainy spell. CH001 features a gentle slope controlling and slowing the eventual release of water into the adjoining brook. Increasing the hard impermeable surfaces of a development would accelerate water release into the brook, increasing the flood risk downstream, particularly in the Tay Close area where the brook passes under a low bridge. Nationwide, the intensity of flood events has increased and impacted areas that have not previously been affected. Flood risk is becoming less predictable as our weather patterns are changing. If an area does experience a flood or is reassessed as a higher flood risk, then insurance premiums become unaffordable or unavailable. Flood risk can no longer be predicted. The term "unprecedented rainfall" is now redundant and is becoming the norm, as well publicised recent events nationwide would testify. From the Local Government Association website: "Urbanisation has reduced the ability of land to absorb rainfall through the introduction of hard, impermeable surfaces. This results in an increase in the volume and rate of surface run-off as less water infiltrates into the ground." You don't have to be an environmental genius to come up with that statement. When flooding occurs, particularly flash flooding, the risk of which would be greatly increased, what compensation is available to cover the increased insurance cost, if insurance is available at all. Would affected residents be left with the option of attempting to sue in order to recoup their increased costs, citing past development refusals as the basis for compensation. Who would take responsibility, developers or councils? Obviously Cheadle is not the Cotswolds but for many residents green space is readily	- CH001 has already been identified as an appropriate area for housing in the adopted Core Strategy. Any scheme would need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping. - See response to PO1507 regarding properties for sale. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							accessible for recreational purposes, walking and jogging, generally adding to residents quality of life. Filling in every available green space is poor planning and town design, something that is reminiscent of decades past. Large concentrations of housing has long since been frowned upon and the balance of housing and green space in the Cheadle North East area is better than some other towns. The difference is that the Cotswolds is largely protected and the Prime Minister lives there. Further, consider the voting, consultation process. If it were based solely upon the designated area that the resident(s) lived closest to, then the planning refusals of the past concerning CH001 would remain but when residents are anxious to protect their own area of the environment elsewhere around Cheadle and can be organised or led into objecting to a collection of other identified sites whilst not commenting or objecting to another, then the nominated “sacrificial lamb” is out voted by some margin. Looking at the map designations, the areas designated as Visual Open Space are few but the land designated for development is considerable. Due to the fact that the proposed development of CH001 would have the maximum adverse impact upon existing residents, given that it is bordered by more existing residents than most of the other proposed sites, plus those residents in the adjoining road structure, it would make more sense to for this to be Visual Open Space instead of being used to connect the existing housing to form one of the largest blocks of housing in Cheadle.	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10268 PO10269 PO10270 PO10271 PO10272 PO10273 PO4787 PO4811	Mr A Copcutt Mr R Gallagher Mrs G Smith J Horsley Ms Mary Walchester Mr Keeling Mr & Mrs R & J Lovatt Mrs R Johnson				Broad Area 1 – CH001		Area CH001 Although within the town boundary, the over-development of this area, circa 240 houses, will generate an unacceptable volume of traffic, when taking into consideration traffic on the Oakamoor Road from JCB, and the MJS Transport depot which has now been given permission to expand their operations, resulting in more heavy goods vehicular traffic on Froghall Road. The Cheadle Town centre traffic survey of November 2015 omitted to include the Froghall Road junction to highlight its inherent problems. Public right of way crossing Area 1, which in accordance with National Legislation and ByeLaws should remain in place, which would mean any development would be in fragmented sections, with associated access problems. Historic evidence of coal extraction in this area. Old mine workings, 2 disused mine shafts and bell pits with associated waste products would make the stability of this area questionable. I can find no evidence that SMDC has carried out a comprehensive survey to assess the suitability of the land for building use, and until this is done the area must be rendered unsuitable for development. Part of the proposed Area 001 is considered to be a flooding risk. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley drive for 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension; accordingly, we are asking you to remove these sites from the plan and move the location of a potential new School to a more sensible, sustainable and central location.	- See response to PO7463 and PO1382 regarding access and traffic. - See response to PO1507 regarding existing footpaths. - See response to PO1507 regarding former mineral workings. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - See response to PO2808 regarding the Thorley Drive housing application.
PO9084	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	Given CH001 represents 240 dwellings, these clearly cannot be accommodated within the town boundary marked on the map.	Site CH001 is located within the existing town boundary. It is estimated that the site could accommodate approximately 240 dwellings based on 35 dwellings per hectare.
PO7471	Mr Jack Dempsey				Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	One of Staffordshire Moorlands most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and we demand that the Council resists giving up the Districts assets to unnecessary housing, solely to provide the Council with revenue. There are a significant number of so called 'brown field' sites in the district. These are sites which previously supported industry and/or housing, which has been cleared (in the main) to leave what is seen as unattractive areas of land close to new or existing housing developments, yet difficult to redevelop due to some other issues. It would be proper if the Council were to agree not to develop on 'green field' or even 'green belt' land, until these 'brown field' sites	- See response to PO2571 regarding brownfield sites. - See response to PO6906 regarding landscape. - See response to PO1507 regarding employment and jobs. - See response to PO1507 regarding mining legacy. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - See response to PO7463 and PO1382 regarding traffic. - See response to PO6906 regarding heritage impact. - See response to PO1382 regarding need for new housing. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							have been redeveloped. Some of these ‘brown field’ sites are known to be contaminated with compounds that had been used during the various manufacturing processes carried out at these locations, and I believe that the longer these sites are left in the current state, the more difficult any subsequent ‘clean up’ operation will become. In the case of the ‘Thomas Bolton’ site at Froghall, there are people who know exactly where the various compounds were dumped when the site was partially cleared – in this case they were placed in a number of pits, the whereabouts known only to those directly involved in the work. These people will not be around for ever, thus the Council should make every effort now to identify the contaminated areas with a view to making the land safe and thus more suitable for development. The situation can only get worse, the longer it is ignored. Land on the fringe of towns and villages is in grave danger of being lost to urban sprawl. Greenfield land provides an immeasurable sense of well-being to residents both aesthetically and recreationally through its very existence and via the network of public footpaths. It is a habitat for our declining wildlife and agricultural sites provide a much needed food resource. You can’t even graze cattle on brownfield sites, which is one of the uses to which the proposed site is currently capitalised. Cheadle is a fine town . It is attractive when entering from the surrounding countryside. So much so that the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council regularly use the view of Cheadle from the North East as a banner to their various documents. It would be a shame to spoil that idyllic view of the town by introducing housing on those very approaches. Of course land to the North of Cheadle consists mainly of ‘green field’ and ‘green belt’ land and as such enhance the idyllic view. Development on those approached would make it very difficult for any photographer to reproduce the Council’s well used banner, without significant use of ‘photo-shop’ and/or ‘air-brushing’. Without sufficient places to work locally the people who’ll be able to afford to buy/rent these houses will have to work somewhere...Potteries? – thus reducing the ‘green’ potential by having people driving there and back each day and in turn clogging up Cheadle at ‘rush-hour’. The town is steeped in history and already famous for ‘Pugin’s Gem’, which does bring visitors to the town. There are many examples of the past, both distant and not so, to be found in and around Cheadle. For instance everyone knows of Cheadle’s rich past with the coal industry, but few know of the 19 th century tramlines that cut through the North and North East of Cheadle. These tram lines brought coal from the various ‘pits’ and routed the wagons to a wharf on the Caldon canal near to Oakamoor. This part of the canal was lost, as was most of the canal between Froghall and Uttoxeter, when the railway line was constructed. The exact route of both canal and railway can be ascertained with	prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							reference to ‘old maps’ of the area (as can the route of the tramways). More recently Cheadle played a key role in one of the World’s best kept secrets . Only now are we hearing the story of what went on at Cheadle and at Bletchley Park (in Buckinghamshire) and specifically with respect to one or two people who worked there. People tell us that the last war was shortened by 2 years due to the work carried out there. Even now the processes used to analyse those wartime signals and traffic is considered too important to publish, and remains on the secret list. Yet, the signals unit that was to the North East of Cheadle played a most important role in the functioning of Bletchley Park. Signals were intercepted here at Cheadle and at other stations around the country. Cheadle formed one of the main ‘feeder’ stations to Bletchley Park, pre-processing the signals collected from the other stations – in some cases decoding them here – before feeding them into the relevant ‘hut’ at Bletchley. Because it was and still is quite a secret not a lot is known about this – even locally (people who did work there are still gagged under the Official Secrets Act). It is know that the area we call Area 2 is still know to the ‘locals’ as ‘up by t military’, for this very reason. The aerial masts have long gone (18 years ago) and there is little that remains to suggest its previous use, but this is without doubt a very important historical site. There may be lots of below surface infrastructure such as cables and foundations that were not removed at that time. After the war, the topography of the local area, with its many mineshafts made it attractive to the government of the time to facilitate the disposal of surplus yet brand new goods. These ‘goods’ consisted of just about anything you could think of from paints to cables, and from radios to ordnance. In fact so many brand new items were deposited down the shafts of Cheadle that a small cottage industry grew from farmers bringing some of these items back to the surface and selling them on. Of course when a certain shaft, which was used to dump weapons and cables, caught fire this brought a swift end to some of these activities. Eventually, this lead to an explosion which resulted in the capping on the mineshaft being fired into the air. The fire was brought under control and the cap was replaced. There are lots of mineshafts and associated underground tunnels in the Cheadle area – it is after all on the Eastern most end of the Staffordshire coalfield. Most mines are well documented – but some aren’t. Any development of land anywhere in the Cheadle area needs to consider carefully the potential for mining subsidence and/or sinkholes which could open up anywhere. This area does suffer from flooding, and always has. Sometime in the past (long ago) the land was drained down the natural slope and into Cecily Brook at the bottom. Sometimes the amount of water that falls is too much for the drainage system to cope with and large lake like areas	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							become flooded. There is an interesting hole around the centre of CH132 in the flooded area where large quantities of water disappear noisily into the ground – rather like a plug hole in a sink, but on a much grander scale. Tentative work with a stick would suggest that the water sinks some distance – certainly up to a metre. I am concerned that if this land is developed (dug up for housing foundations etc.) then the existing historic drainage system will become non-operational, and this could lead to quite a bit more flooding because only surface run off would be draining the excess water. To replace the existing field drains might be a rather expensive alternative. The chances of development on Area 1 are at least very high. This area has featured on the Council's preferred list for at least 20 years now. I note that the scoring system used to place CH132 in the lead position is based on access to facilities (as it was for Area 1) called sustainability – an interesting word that covers various things such as health care, schools, shops and pubs. There is only one shop on Froghall Road and this is well away from the development site, there was a public house on Froghall Road that has been closed for some time and is likely to be demolished to redevelop the land, and schools and health care facilities are further from CH132 than any of the other suggested sites. The access into town involves a bottleneck at the Froghall Road / Leek Road junction in addition to the gyratory melee known as the town centre, which, due to it's one way system, opposes traffic flow in every direction. Whatever happened to the various plans and master plans we were promised to look into and hopefully alleviate the traffic issues of Cheadle. Speaking to local builders, there is still the shadow of recession lurking, never too far away. They are 'not keen' to invest monies into building houses that they are then unable to sell. A number of builders have already done some 'in-fill' development only to find that they don't have a quick sale for the properties once built/and or modernised. Too many new houses WILL depress the market further, making them uneconomic to build (this fact seemingly at odds with the Council's desire for affordable homes – affordable for who, the buyer or the builder?). The China triggered recession is just around the corner and who knows what will happen when the EU referendum completes. I doubt anyone can foresee the economy for the next 10 years never mind the next 20. If they could, why is this country still taking austerity measures to try to make ends meet, why oh why! In summary: Please – reconsider the numbers. There is a lot of evidence to suggest that building this number of houses in Cheadle, and furthermore your plans for development across the district, would be pure folly. Please – use 'brown field' sites before anything 'green'. Please – consider the aesthetics of the immediate area. Many people choose to live here based on it being a pleasant place to live. By bringing in people (houses)	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4189							with no local work prospects (factories) you are creating a dormitory town and adding to the daily rush of people travelling from Cheadle to the Potteries (by either the A50 or the A52 – both known to suffer from congestion during ‘rush-hour’). Please – try to compliment the history of Cheadle. Let’s not have a Leek situation where we allowed development on Railway and Canal historical infrastructure, only to see a great revival looking to recreate those very links back into the town. It was the same situation with the Caldon canal (or more properly the Uttoxeter canal) which was allowed to have a railway built on top of it from Froghall Wharf towards Oakamoor and beyond. I know there are a number of incentives to see that canal opened up again, even if it means a slightly different route at times. What happened to forward plans here then? Please – don’t forget the history of Cheadle land. It’s been mined for hundreds of years, sometimes no useful records remain. Consider carefully where to build and how to build. You don’t know what might just be under the surface. Please – do remember that flooding does occur in and around this area specifically – I can’t speak for any other areas because I’ve only witnessed this directly in land adjacent to the caravan site (area CH132). As pointed out in my previous representations on this matter, which the Council have decided not to consider against this ‘new’ plan, the flora and fauna of CH132 supports this ‘wet’ description as it consists of a lot of reeds (which you don’t get on dry soil). Please – Please - reconsider your scoring for amenities for this area. Schools – none. Healthcare – town center. Shops – town center (excluding 1 on Froghall Road). Pubs – none. Work – none. Public transport – yes a bus route to the Potteries, but no good if you have to work in Cheadle at Brookhouses Industrial Estate (which you can’t get to without adding to the traffic chaos at ‘rush hour’). Road infrastructure – no change over many years (BAD). Please - Please - Please - if these houses are being considered as essential to allow the UK to absorb as many Eastern European and Middle East immigrants as possible, I would like to suggest that our own homeless, our own homeless/jobless ex-servicemen and our own children should get first access to whatever we build, where ever we build it. Perhaps the Council would be prepared to bring unsold houses on to its books to subsequently offer up to such refugees/immigrants, after our own homeless families.	
	PO3227	Mr N Hewitt			Broad Area 1 - CH001	Object	I object to this housing allocation on the grounds of access and the state of the roads system in Cheadle. If we continue to build houses without doing something with the present road system Cheadle will be a total gridlock. How come Leek, Biddulph doesn’t get the same applications has Cheadle. The arrogance of the planners and councillors is beyond belief. They think they can dump everything on Cheadle. The last consultation was only advertised on twitter and a poster in the library. Was this so	• See response to PO7463 and PO1382 regarding highways and traffic • See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. • See reponse to PO1507 regarding former mineral workings. • The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from Cheadle residents which

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							there would be no one to protest. Everything revolves around Leek and Biddulph I cannot believe this site has been proposed. Anyone who has walked that field will know that it is water logged for the biggest part of the year. Also there are shafts in the area. Plus where is the access to this site going to be Hammerly Hayes Road in totally a unsuitable for this amount of traffic, and more traffic on Ness grove estate, which is used as a rat run now. Will be the congestion in the town centre before more houses are built.	suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation.
PO804	Ms Alison Conybeare				Broad Area 1 - CH001	General comment	Please seek the local residents views on all the housing proposals. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
CH132								
PO6912		Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	CH132	Support	The Council has proposed site CH132 as a preferred allocation for Cheadle for 80 dwellings. This forms part of a wider urban extension (along with CH001) for the north of Cheadle for around 320 dwellings. Mosaic considers that this represents a logical and deliverable solution to meet a significant proportion of the town's needs, which is welcomed as part of the PSA. As illustrated on the plan supporting the allocation, the Council has indicated that the site could provide a location for a new primary school in addition to residential uses. This position has been confirmed with Staffordshire County Council and it is considered that as part of the wider masterplan for the site, land can be safeguarded for the Council to bring forward a new primary school in line with evidence of need. The figure of 80 dwellings on the site was proposed by Mosaic as part of discussions with the Council however, reflecting the comments above, Mosaic consider it appropriate for the Council to present this figure as a minimum, if it is decided that the site could deliver additional dwellings, or the County Council take the decision that a new school site would be better located elsewhere. A number of comments were received concerning this site in response to the previous consultation, summarised below: Comments were received from Staffordshire County Council (SCC) as the statutory agency responsible for highways. The comments considered the suitability of the adjacent road network and the potential access points. It was perhaps not understood by SCC that this site would be accessed from CH001, as illustrated in the wider masterplan for the site prepared by Mosaic, however the site is considered deliverable from a highways perspective. Following the Cheadle Transport Study, it is understood that the Council are considering ways in which the local highways network can be upgraded and the site promoters will remain in discussion with the Council in respect of land to the north of Cheadle. Natural England has commented on the proposed allocation, echoing comments similar to those offered in response to CH001. As previously noted, issues of landscape	- Developer support for the site and the location of a new primary school is noted. 80 dwellings is an estimated number of dwellings based on an average density and is not fixed. - Traffic – The highways authority have advised that appropriately designed accesses would accommodate 240 + 80 + School. This number would require at least 2 accesses. A new access off Froghall Road would be preferable with secondary accesses through the existing estate. If the 80 units were separate, they could be served off a single point. Pedestrian connections should be made to the residential area to the north. - Comments regarding flood risk are noted. A FRA would be required. - The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) has considered the site as being of medium landscape sensitivity and suggests some site-specific landscape mitigation measures such as limiting building heights and advanced planting on the southern boundary. - The land is Agricultural Class 3 Good to Moderate. Data supplied by Natural England indicates that there is a moderate likelihood that the land is best and most versatile land i.e. Class 3a. The Sustainability Appraisal will be updated to reflect the most up to date evidence base.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4191							impact have been considered as part of the delivery document prepared by RPS for Mosaic, which took the view that this site had the capacity to accommodate residential development without detriment to landscape or visual amenity. It is noted that a small section of the site falls within Flood Zone 3. This has been accounted for in the latest masterplan provided to the Council, which indicates that a green buffer could be provided in this area which would ensure that instances of potential flood risk can be avoided, compatible with the NPPF. The Council's own comments from the Sustainability Appraisal offer largely supportive comments on the sustainability of the site. There are however negative comments linked to the Grade 3 Agricultural Land Classification of the site. The Council has not defined whether this is Grade 3a or Grade 3b land, taking a broad brush approach to the assessment. In either case, Grade 3a represents only marginally better quality land than 3b, which is not recognised as 'best and most versatile', along with categories Grade 1 and Grade 2. It appears that the assessment of significant negative effect is, in this regard, an inappropriate conclusion. Mosaic welcomes the Council's inclusion of site CH132 as part of a wider allocation to the north of Cheadle. The information submitted as part of the 2014 Delivery Document to the Council includes evidence and a strategy of how the site can be delivered which addresses the concerns raised as part of the earlier consultation and is capable of assisting the County Council in finding land for a new primary school.	
	PO400	Mrs Joanne Chadwick			CH132	Support	Makes sense to propose housing development near the new school good access roads more balanced developemnt for Cheadle town.	Support noted.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1383	Mrs J Schmidt				CH132	Object	I wish to add my complaints to the proposed development of 400+ houses + a school in front of the of the Park Home development of Broad Hayes Park down to the Oakamoor – Cheadle Road bordering hales Hall + Caravan plus Leisure Park. We urge the responsibilities of the council under the human rights act in particular protocol 1 article 1 which states that a person has the right to a peaceful enjoyment which include the home + other land. We believe that article 8 of the Human Rights act states that a person has substantive right to respect for their private + family life. In the case of Britain V SOS the courts reappraised the purposes of the law + concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of article 8. Private + Family life therefore encompass not only the homes but also the surroundings. As the occupants of Broad Hayes Park Homes are mostly retained in the over 70's group. They should be able to enjoy their retirement in peace + quiet without extra traffic ect that the Cheadle Roads cannot cope with the already plus all the noise from building 400 + houses + roads would be detrimental to their lives. As I was thinking of retiring to that area myself I feel I should send you my letter of complaint.	Amenity issues and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received, and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2734 PO2746 PO2742 PO2763 PO2680 PO3013 PO2676 PO3018 PO2657 PO2893 PO2876 PO2849 PO2759 PO2665 PO2721 PO2653 PO2974 PO3009 PO3004 PO2694 PO1713 PO2617 PO2640 PO2605 PO2609 PO2620 PO2938 PO2933 PO2984 PO2717 PO2969 PO2738 PO2790 PO2813 PO2768 PO2776 PO2989 PO2828 PO2672 PO2837 PO2943 PO2645 PO2269 PO2755 PO2661 PO2636	Mr R Snow Mrs V Weston Mr J Weston Mrs J Weston Mr A Hide Mrs J Foster Mrs D Hide Cllr H Lingard Mr R Owen-Jones Mr A Moss Mrs M Moss Mr M Tunnicliffe Mr A Weston Mr C Alcock Mr A Allen Mrs A Austin Mr J Baggley Mr D Barnes Mrs S Barnes Mr E Cartlidge Mrs K Cartlidge Mr A Eaton Mrs C Edwards Mr M Feather Mrs A Feather Mr D Flynn Mr B Fraser Mrs C Fraser Mr R Fryer Mr A Gibson M Glover Mrs K Green Miss A Gregory Mrs Vera James Mrs H Keeling Mr Stefan Lilleker Mr Ian Menzies Lingard Mrs B Massey Mr Gareth Owen-Jones Mrs Christine Pickin D Pittman Mr And Mrs T & J Prince Miss Lynne Sanders Mr Oliver Weston Mr A Emery Mr Clive Green				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field Is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	- Site CH132 is not the same area as 'broad Area 2' which was considered during the Core Strategy examination. Broad Area 2 was a significantly larger area than site CH132 and could accommodate up to 320 dwellings. A large proportion of this broad area was located to the east of the Cecilly Brook and extended to the east into the open countryside. During the consideration of 'broad Area 2' the Inspector raised concerns regarding evidence in the SA which did not justify the 'broad area' particularly as the County Council could not confirm at that stage that a new school would be needed. An updated Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken which looks in more detail at individual housing site options rather than a broad brush approach taken to the broad area. CH132 is a small section of the previous 'broad Area 2 and together with site CH001 to the south forms a logical and deliverable solution, including land for a new primary school which is supported by the developer. - Traffic – The highways authority have advised that appropriately designed accesses would accommodate 240 + 80 + School. This number would require at least 2 accesses. A new access off Froghall Road would be preferable with secondary accesses through the existing estate. If the 80 units were separate, they could be served off a single point. Pedestrian connections should be made to the residential area to the north. - The location of the school site to the north of Cheadle is supported by Staffordshire County Council and considers it's location would offer a good spread across Cheadle. - The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) identifies the likely impacts of the housing / employment Preferred Options sites on the surrounding highway network. By 2031 the study predicts queuing and delays in certain locations, in part due to 17 years of potential traffic growth which is compounded by the additional trips generated by new housing and employment. There is limited scope to change junction characteristics to improve network capacity within the Town Centre due to its historically confined road structure. The study recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. Mitigation measures include junction and lane improvements, new sites having good access to public transport provision, measures to encourage walking & cycling to reduce short trips, improved HGV signage & new parking bays along High St. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - See response to PO2808 - Cecilly Brook LNR & Water Voles. - See response to PO6912 regarding visual impact and landscape issues. - See response to PO2808 regarding approval at Thorley Drive. - See response to PO6912 regarding agricultural land quality.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2726 PO2730 PO2685 PO2689 PO2626 PO2751 PO3297 PO3302 PO3391 PO3033 PO3251 PO3426 PO3434 PO3415 PO3322 PO3314 PO3378 PO3383 PO3327 PO3394 PO3423 PO3436 PO3441 PO3256 PO3048 PO3043 PO2948 PO2772 PO3099 PO2869 PO3023 PO2979 PO2799 PO3261 PO2958 PO2906 PO2693 PO3028 PO2994 PO2953 PO2843 PO3038 PO3104 PO3053 PO3245 PO3146 PO3235	Mr John Elks Mrs Mavis Elks Mr P Simcock Ms Marie Kennaway Mrs J Whitefield Mr D Weston Mrs J Birks Mr M Birks Helen Abbey Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson K W Alcock Mr C Beardmore Mrs C Broad Mr B Brunt Mr P Brunt Mrs H Brunt Mr S Byatt Mrs V Byatt Mrs J Callear Miss L Chadwick Mrs M Clewes Mr G Davall Mrs I Davall Mr R Davis Mrs E Moulton Mr K G Moulton D Pittman Mrs K Rogers Mrs J Seddon Mrs D Tunnicliffe Mr D Waring Mrs S Wiseman Mrs F Worsley Mr A.R. Eaton Mrs P Griffiths Mr R James Mr J Shipley Mrs A Jones Mr M Sposito Mr R Griffiths Mrs H Simcock Mrs S Clare Mr D Gould Mr A Shenton Mr C Smith Mrs J Davies Mrs M Snow				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3151 PO3089 PO3131 PO3166 PO3126 PO3161 PO3156 PO3171 PO3218 PO3240 PO3212 PO3207 PO3202 PO3197 PO3192 PO3187 PO3069 PO3182 PO3064 PO3176 PO3059 PO3229 PO3310 PO3115 PO3120 PO3224 PO3545 PO3534 PO3582 PO3665 PO3606 PO3573 PO3587 PO3457 PO3452 PO3630 PO3627 PO3465 PO3460 PO3603 PO3505 PO3502 PO3576 PO3590 PO3529 PO3490 PO3354	Mrs J Titterton Mrs B Barks Mr A Ainsworth Mr D Ainsworth Mr G Clewlow Mr D Dunn Mrs P Dunn Mr D Ratcliffe Mr D Ratcliffe Mr R Lees Mr R Ball Mr J Hewitt Miss K Pickford – Avery Mrs P Routledge Mrs A Rogers Miss S Ford Mr J Lawler Mrs P Wordsworth Mr C Foster Mr P Hollywood Mr A Hollywood Mr N Hewitt Mr I Millward Miss P Millward Mr B Clare Mr P Heath Mrs M Plant Mr L Plant Ms Gina Boston K W Alcock Mrs P Allum Mr L Austin Mr M Boston Mrs S Brindley Mr D Brindley Mr N Brooks Mrs P Brooks Mrs J Campbell Mr D Campbell Mr K Davall Mr R Dennis Mrs S Dennis Mrs K Drummond Mr A Drummond Mr J Edwards Mr M Elvidge Mr D Fernihough				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field Is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3513 PO3635 PO3367 PO3484 PO3343 PO3375 PO3449 PO3444 PO3476 PO3611 PO3560 PO3619 PO3673 PO3549 PO3614 PO3526 PO3568 PO3565 PO3338 PO3595 PO3651 PO3493 PO3267 PO3399 PO3293 PO3510 PO3346 PO3670 PO3473 PO3468 PO3518 PO3370 PO3306 PO3335 PO3330 PO3521 PO3552 PO3557 PO3311 PO3386 PO3351 PO3272 PO3278 PO7458 PO3283 PO3283 PO3418 PO3853	Mrs A Fox Mrs H Frame Mrs T Frame Mr F Harding Mr C Hayes Mrs F R Hayward Mrs P Johnson Mr Roger Johnson Mr and Mrs D Keates Mrs H Keeling Mr K Mannion Mr D Potts Miss G Potts Mr & Mrs J & C Smith Mr D Thomas M Turley Mrs J Vasselin Miss R Vasselin Mr S Waring Mr K Weston Mr K Whitefield Mr D Woodward Mrs J F Eaton Mr S Cutler Mr D Renshaw M Stevenson Mr C Jones Mr & Mrs V Elks Mr D Hancock Mrs J M Hancock Mr J Kennaway Mrs M E Nicholls Mr M Burton Ms A Keates Mr A Keates Mr H A Gibson Mr J Bossons Mrs R H Bossons Mr A Gough Mr A Gough Mrs J Hewitt Mr and Mrs A Brown Mr S Hassall Mr C Machin Mrs C Moseley Mrs B Heesman Mr A Massey Mr P Silk				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3662 PO3678 PO3681 PO3686 PO3689 PO3699 PO3702 PO3707 PO3710 PO3716 PO3720 PO3723 PO3729 PO3732 PO3737 PO3740 PO3745 PO3753 PO3756 PO3761 PO3764 PO3769 PO3772 PO3777 PO3780 PO3785 PO3788 PO3793 PO3801 PO3804 PO3810 PO3813 PO3818 PO3821 PO3826 PO3829 PO3834 PO3837 PO3842 PO3845 PO3850 PO3648 PO3359 PO2632 PO2613 PO2644 PO4774	Mr and Mrs V Elks Mr G Hodgkinson Mrs K Smith Mr I Crawford Mrs J Crawford Mr J A Hayes Mr M Shirley Mr and Mrs M Nadova Mr P Cope Mrs J Cope Mr W Elks Mr D Richards Mr M Nad Ms T Janete Miss T Boulton Mrs J Saggars Mr C Loving Mrs J Richardson Mrs C Hopkinson Mr and Mrs S Abbey Mrs P Richards Mr B Johnson Miss K Beardmore Mrs J Richards Mr R Broad Miss E Clough Mr P Clough Mr G Barks Mr P Titterton Miss K Wilson Miss R Oulsnam Miss R Allen Miss J Seddon Mr A Fox Miss T Millward Mr A Millward Mr R Turley Mrs D Harrison Mr A Wright Mr D Tomkinson Mrs J Tomkinson Mr K Pickin Mr David Kennaway Mrs R Green Mrs Ena Wetwood Mr & Mrs T & J Prince Mr Alan Copcutt				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field Is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3407 PO3319 PO3084 PO3094	Mrs Sara Tavernor Mrs Mary Jones Mr A Hewitt Mr R Lees				CH132	Object	This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the inspector's recommendation for removal of this site. In appendix 1 of the preferred options and boundaries report prepared for the council assembly meeting on the 13/04/2016, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, SMDC has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. The highways dept has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be ltd to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required If other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous land owner. Subject to flooding due to Cecilly Mills Brook Adjacent to Cecilly Mills Brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species) The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact The last consultation, the proposed development of this field is large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighbouring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more substantial (as compiled in the councils sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, removal of CH132 in its entirety, Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in the light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley Drive 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension: accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 in the plan and move the location of potential new school to a more sensible, more sustainable and central location.	• See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. • See response to PO2734 regarding access. • See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. • See response to PO2808 regarding Cecilly Brook LNR and water voles. • See response to PO6912 regarding agricultural land quality. • See response to PO2808 regarding recent approval at Thorley Drive.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3796 PO3402 PO3410 PO3074 PO3136 PO3143 PO2999 PO2868	Mr A Wilson Mr David Tavernor Mrs Brenda Mills Mr W Wordsworth Mr N Watson Mr and Mrs J Greenwood E Sposito Mrs Dorothy Tunncliffe				CH132	Object	Logic suggest that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required t contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable.	- Site CH024 was previously earmarked for a school in the 1998 Local Plan. Site CH009 was not included within this area. Access to the site was subsequently acquired to serve the adjacent factory and the remaining part of CH024 became landlocked. - Staffordshire County Council support the preferred location for the new school and consider it provides for a good spread of provision around the town. In terms of spatial distribution the location of the previous site and the preferred site are close together. No housing allocations are proposed on the east of Cheadle and therefore it is not the most sustainable location for a new school. - Staffordshire County Council estimate that 1.2 ha is require to deliver a 1 Form Entry school. Site CH024 is surrounded by existing development and would be unlikely to accommodate any further expansion. - The previous site has a limited frontage and offers less opportunity to arrange the school access and how the building fits within the street scene. It also is surrounded by residential streets and may lead to residential amenity issues during the school run. The preferred site can be accommodated into the estate in such a way to design out such issues. - The previous site has good access on foot although some of the routes from residential areas lead through areas that are not overlooked. The preferred school site can have access designed and delivered to the most appropriate standard. - The delivery of a new school will need to be funded by developer contributions and the cost will include land acquisition and building costs. The inclusion of safeguarded land for a school as part of a wider masterplan means that the school is likely to be deliverable and appropriately designed.
PO4775 PO4791 PO4816 PO4801 PO4821 PO4796 PO4781 PO4806	Mr Alan Copcutt Mr Richard Gallagher Mrs G Smith Jean Horsley Ms Mary Walchester Mr Keeling Mr and Mrs R & J Lovatt Mrs R Johnson				CH132	Object	The planning Inspector previously deemed Area CH0132 unsound and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning is behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the Inspectors recommendation for removal of this site. In Appendix 1 of the Preferred Options and Boundaries report prepared for the Council Assembly meeting on the 13/4/16, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. “The Highways Department has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be limited to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required if other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous landowners” Subject to flooding due to the Cecilly Mills Brook. Adjacent to Cecilly Mills brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species). The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact In the last consultation, the proposed development of	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							this field generated a large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighboring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more sustainable (as compiled in the councils' sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the Inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, the removal of CH132 in its entirety. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley drive for 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension; accordingly, we are asking you to remove these sites from the plan and move the location of a potential new School to a more sensible, sustainable and central location.	
PO7469	Mr Jack Dempsey				CH132	Object	I thought that having been through planning exercises twice in the past and having this area removed from the plans twice that SMDC would not be so bold to place the area back into their plans. This area was previously deemed unsound by the planning Inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning is behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the Inspectors recommendation for removal of this site. In Appendix 1 of the Preferred Options and Boundaries report prepared for the Council Assembly meeting on the 13/4/16, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. "The Highways Department has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be limited to 50 if accessed through the adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required if other accesses were to be gained onto the site. This would involve numerous landowners". Subject to flooding due to the Cecilly Mills Brook. Adjacent to Cecilly Mills brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species). The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land. Elevated land heightening visual impact. In the last consultation, the proposed development of this field generated a large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighboring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more sustainable (as compiled in the councils' sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the Inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, the removal of CH132 in its entirety. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that this field is no longer required in light of the recent planning application approval at Thorley drive for 60 houses on the 12 th May 2016, this new development will be classified as urban extension; accordingly, we are asking you to remove CH132 from the plan and move the location of a potential new School to a more	• See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. • See response to PO2734 regarding access. • See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. • See response to PO2808 regarding Cecilly Brook LNR and water voles. • See response to PO2808 regarding recent approval at Thorley Drive. • See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							sensible, sustainable and central location.	
PO7076	MRS PENNY PLANT				CH132	Object	I object to the proposed site allocation of CH132.	Objection noted.
PO7072	Mr Alex Plant				CH132	Object	I object to the proposed site allocation of CH132.	Objection noted.
PO7464	Ms Linda Powell				CH132	Object	Area CH0132 was previously deemed unsound by the planning Inspector and it is difficult to comprehend what the reasoning is behind again including this area, especially as nothing has changed since the Inspectors recommendation for removal of this site. In Appendix 1 of the Preferred Options and Boundaries report prepared for the Council Assembly meeting on the 13/4/16, pages 53-55 of the Cheadle section, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council has raised the following issues regarding site CH132. "The Highways Department has raised issues regarding access. Number of dwellings would be limited to 50 if accessed through adjacent site CH001. Additional land would be required if other access gained onto the site which would involve numerous landowners" Subject to flooding due to the Cecilly Mills Brook. Adjacent to Cecilly Mills brook which has a strong population of water voles (protected species). The field is Greenfield grade 3 ALC land Elevated land heightening visual impact In the last consultation, the proposed development of this field generated a large number of public objections (290), indicating the strength of feeling by neighboring residents. There are other sites within Cheadle which are infinitely more sustainable (as compiled in the councils' sustainability charts) which have been discounted. It goes without saying that any decisions must be capable of standing up to the scrutiny of the Inspector so as not to arrive in the same situation as before, that is, the removal of CH132 in its entirety.	- See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. - See response to PO2734 regarding access. - See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - See response to PO2808 regarding Cecilly Brook LNR and water voles. - See response to PO6912 regarding agricultural land quality. - See response to PO2808 regarding recent approval at Thorley Drive. - See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school.
PO1076	Mrs Janet Heaps-Warby				CH132	Object	I don't understand why yet again they are trying to build houses on this site when it has already been deemed unsuitable by the planning inspector? WHY? Would you want to build where it isn't suitable .	See response to PO2734 regarding site CH132.
PO2749	Mr D Weston				CH132	Object	The school is poorly situated with regard to access for the majority of the north end of the town. Housing in CH132 is a poor choice backed up reflected in the staffs moorlands documentation is one of the less sustainable areas to build	See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school.
PO2972	Mr Jason Baggley				CH132	Object	Based on the all the facts and evidence CH132 proposed site is ridiculous and question whether the reasoning is based on class divide (social housing) I think, that we wouldn't care. The field is greenfield grade 3 and beautiful and previously deemed unsound by inspector's, who must be coerced for this land to be considered again. There are better less impacted plots I'm sure	- See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. - See response to PO6912 regarding agricultural land quality.
PO2535	Mrs D Hide				CH132	Object	I'm concerned about the suggested housing for the area CH132, my concerns are for the flooding that already occurs by Cecilly brook of Tay Close doesn't take much rain now for the flooding to happen, imagine if there was another 80 or more houses not the field directly above this area, more concrete less soak away	- See response to PO1507 regarding flood risk. - See response to PO2808 regarding nature conservation issues. - See response to PO2734 regarding access.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							more strain on the sewage system. Also have trees for the birds and the other animals which there are in abundance. The roads around they have not been designed to take more cars and for each house again you build, we could be talking over 2 cars extra for each property on local roads.	
PO3097	Mrs J Seddon				CH132	Object	This site bordered by significant number of single storey homes, specifically for the over 50's and people with disabilities. Some of these homes are privately owned but sites on a residential park home site (which approved by the council). Others are local housing association. Surely it is very in - appropriate to build family homes and schools on site which is boarded by these single storey homes occupied by the most vulnerable of our community. These people need peace and quiet being and a feeling of safety in order to enjoy wellbeing. Please remove this site from CH132 from any proposal housing and school plans for Cheadle.	See response to PO1383 regarding amenity issues.
PO3011	Mrs J Foster				CH132	Object	The existing roads in Cheadle can't cope with the volume of traffic. To build more houses will make the road system impossible. Ness Grove was built as a small estate road, it is used as a rat run and not designed to take the current level of traffic.	See response to PO2734 regarding access.
PO2931	Mrs Catherine Fraser				CH132	Object	Is unsuitable forth proposed housing, as has been evidenced by the planning officer/inspector deeming the site 'unsound'? Why has it again been included?? The traffic exiting and entering the junction between Froghall Road + is already dangerous and difficult. The infrastructure in Cheadle struggles at present, increasing the housing stock before addressing this problem is ridiculous. Adding more housing without the chance of employment will mean yet more traffic in or rural roads, with people travelling to the cities to their employment, thereby again increasing pollution levels. How can you justify raising this application again when it has been throw out by the planning inspectors! There are more suitable areas for housing than CH132 which has a high conservation value and habitat. If Cheadle is to have more houses on the scale then the infrastructures has to be done before the building of more houses. It defies logic to build a school at the furthest outpost of Cheadle, surely it should be as central as possible, children can then walk to school and much less traffic occurring. I do not understand how anyone could suggest building a school at the furthest end of town, which will inevitably result in far more car journeys. Having children able to walk to school not only protects there health it also protects the environment. I.e.: less pollution. Please reconsider this crazy proposal.	• See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. • See response to PO2734 regarding access and traffic • See response to PO2808 regarding nature conservation issues. • See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school.
PO2936	Mr Barry Fraser				CH132	Object	How can you justify raising this application again when it has been thrown out by the planning inspectors! There are more suitable areas for housing on this scale if Cheadle is to have more houses than CH132 which has high conservation value and habit, if Cheadle is to have more houses on a scale then the infrastructure has to be in place before the building of houses. It	• See response to PO2734 regarding Core Strategy Examination. • See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? CH001 and CH132

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							defies logic to build a school at the furthest outpost of Cheadle, surely it should be central as possible, children can walk to school and much less traffic occurring. I am most annoyed, as are a very great number of people in Cheadle 1000's of objections were made your proposal of high numbers of houses built on Greenfield sites around Cheadle and specifically CH132. The planning inspector deemed this proposal unsound and recommended removal of this site. Yet you have ignored this and just re-proposed building houses and school on this site. You have ignored 1000's people who objected to your proposals. I feel certain people will not forget this when the time comes around for your local elections	
PO2536	Mr A Hide				CH132	Object	My concern is that should CH132 be developed the negative impact in increased traffic in an already congested area of town will have serious implications for road safety .	See response to PO2734 regarding traffic. Issues.
PO2544	Mr Albert Allen				CH132	Object	Publically address the town of Cheadle on your road traffic plans CH132 would itself in huge traffic increase on our 2 already heavily congested routes into Cheadle? Green belt is not the answer, brownfield first.	- See response to PO2734 regarding traffic issues - Site CH132 is not designated as Green Belt.
PO4778	Mr and Mrs R & J Lovatt				CH132	Object	To build on CH132 for housing & a school is absolutely stupid. The amenities in Cheadle are all full, Dr's etc. There is nothing to do in Cheadle & enough empty properties without building more. These fields flood regularly we need the fields much more than housing. I totally object to housing.	- See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school. - See response to PO7471 regarding infrastructure.
PO8982	Mrs L J Hurst				CH132	Object	I objected to this area for development previously, for housing but mainly now, I object to the proposal to site a school - a primary school - there. Based on its location it's too far out of town and out on a limb and what a distance from the secondary schools! (AMENDED) Can consideration be given to a new location please? How about the green belt land adjacent to MJS transport on Froghall Road? Exceptional circumstances and plenty of room for expansion.	- See response to PO2734 regarding location of new school. - The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Petition								
Page 4204	952 Signatures						We, the residents of Cheadle south West, consider the allocation of our area is unacceptable because it has given us the largest number of preferred sites, 5 out of 7, for building in Cheadle from a map considering 51 sites, and the largest number of houses, at 430, in the whole of Staffs Moorlands. This is instead of the small distributed developments of which nearly all residents of Cheadle could approve. We will become a super estate without any major public open space. At a consultation in Cheadle SMDC maps wrongly showed the 4 school playing fields as public open space. This inaccuracy is crucial as much of the land behind us should be allocated as public open space, not housing, as we have very little indeed compared to other areas of Cheadle. Our MP Sir William Cash has agreed with us at a meeting on Friday 22nd July that development in Cheadle is “disproportionate”. We believe, with him, that whereas the government requirement for Staffs Moorlands is 2530, the SMDC requirement of 6000 is based on SMDC’s historically high housing acceptance over government required levels. We challenge this injustice.	- The Council has considered a number of sites within and on the edge of Cheadle. The majority of the proposed area for housing is located within the existing town boundary. It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space. - Agreed that not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as ‘open space’ rather than ‘public open space’. A public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and where new public open space is required. - The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district’s full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The adopted Core Strategy sets out the distribution of housing development between the towns and rural areas: Leek 30%, Biddulph 20%, Cheadle 22% and Rural Areas 28%.
	CH085A							
	PO480	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	CH085A	Support	This site is supported in the initial sustainability appraisal report which considered a south-west focus for new housing development. It is well located in relation to existing services within the town, most of which can be reached by means other than the private motor car. The landowners are willing to consider releasing the land for development initially taking access off the existing highways network.
PO476	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				CH085A		In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessable to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availabiliy to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line. This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with	- The Council has considered a number of sites within and on the edge of Cheadle. The majority of the proposed area for housing is located within the existing town boundary. It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space. - The Council’s Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Landscape Assessment for this site. It advises that the site is open however long distance views are screened by the railway embankment located to the north and west of the site. There could be impacts on local landscape character (medium landscape sensitivity). however site-specific landscape

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries. It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances available at that time and the case remains the same to-day. In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school, also most of Cheadle's Industry. Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experiencing problems? A SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO NOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to add another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerous parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town?	mitigation measures could include limiting building heights and planting in the southwest of the site. • New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links. • There are proposals for new housing development to the north of the town. • The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) identifies the likely impacts of the housing and employment Preferred Options sites on the surrounding highway network. By 2031 the study predicts queuing and delays in certain locations, in part due to 17 years of potential traffic growth which is compounded by the additional trips generated by new housing and employment. There is limited scope to change junction characteristics to improve network capacity within the Town Centre due to its historically confined road structure. The study recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. Mitigation measures include junction and lane improvements, new sites having good access to public transport provision, measures to encourage walking and cycling to reduce short trips, improved HGV signage and new parking bays along High Street. • The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential SW link road. Currently there is no link between the A522 Tean Road and Brookhouse Way / A521 due to it being severed by a disused railway line. The railway line is in third party ownership and a bridge will be required to connect a link road through. The proposed link road would allow a percentage of predicted trips from the SW area to traverse Brookhouse Way / A521 opposed to solely the A522, however the level of trips which would use the A521 from this area would have a minimal effect in improving congestion within Cheadle Town Centre. The study considers that the proposed Link Road would not be a solution on its own. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. • The Council has considered a number of sites within and on the edge of Cheadle. There is not enough brownfield land or sites to meet the District's proposed housing requirement within the built up area of the town. This site is located on the edge of the settlement within the existing town boundary. It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space. Distance from the town centre needs to be balanced with other considerations such as Green Belt, Heritage, Landscape and viability / deliverability.
PO1169	Mr P Beesley				CH085A	Object	This land is flood plain + it is always very well. It has been proved in the past that it is unsuitable for building. Proposed relief road goes nowhere would be better going to link with + if this was built then it might become viable	- The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. The area to the west of the site adjacent to the Brook is high probability and can be incorporated into uses other than housing i.e. open space. The Environment Agency has confirmed that a Level 2 SFRA will not be required as the developer should be able to design out flood risk given the small proportion of Flood Zones on the edge of them, and the fact that they are already modelled in detail, so the extents shouldn't increase. Any application would be accompanied by an FRA which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that neighbouring areas are not affected. - See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road.
PO619	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				CH085A	Object	This is too large an area to develop without the infrastructure to support it. The roads are not suitable to take the increased number of vehicles, the town already gets gridlocked at key times of the day. It will create a dense area of housing to the south with shopping and leisure facilities all being in the town and a considerable distance to walk to, this is likely to increase traffic on the roads.	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure.
PO622	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				CH085A	Object	The housing will be too dense to the south of the town and too far away from shopping and leisure facilities meaning that car journeys will be inevitable. This will increase the number of cars travelling both to and through the town (especially at peak times because the new school is planned for the north). The roads can barely manage the current amount of traffic at the moment without the additional number from a new estate in the south. The north of the town is more suitable because it will be close to the new school and it is also less distance to the shopping area of town than it will be from the south.	- There are proposals for new housing development to the north of the town. - See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure.
PO168	Mrs E Baskeyfield				CH085A	Object	Areas CH085A-d & CH128 are too far from the main infrastructure of the town. They are not near to any public open spaces as the majority of those on the plan are private field owned by schools and are not for public use. The new housing proposal for the south would increase congestion on the roads especially as the new school is planned for the north of the town. This will cause increased traffic jams on the roads through the town at peak times. The building of houses in this area will increase the water table significantly as the fields are already heavily waterlogged after rain which will have a negative impact on those further down the valley in Tean who have already had areas under water this year due to flooding. Building in this area will exacerbate this problem.	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. - See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. - The proposed new school is planned to serve the north of Cheadle and could therefore reduce school traffic currently accessing schools in the SW of the town. New housing development is also proposed in the north of the town. There are existing schools located in the SW of Cheadle to meet the needs of residents located in the south of the town. - Agreed that not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. A public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								where improvements are needed to these spaces and where new public open space is required.
PO393	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				CH085A	Object	With the large proposed development of CH085a-d and CH128 Cheadle south west seems to have a disproportionate amount of the housing development for Cheadle, with 400+ of the total allocation being suggested for this area! I do not understand why this area has been chosen over others in view of the fact that a lot of extra traffic will now have to go through the centre of town to leave on the north side. In particular you are suggesting the new primary school is built in the north so this will cause even more traffic congestion as people have to travel from the south to the north of the town with our struggling roads!! There are little/no public space in the south west. As I mentioned previously those listed are school fields not open to the public. Very misleading!!! With this development we will lose even more! This hardly seems fair, balanced or in the interest of public health! Concerns over the size of the estate and how it will be managed effectively. ?? Increased crime, increased traffic, noise and pollution.	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO397	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				CH085A	Object	Unbalanced development in Cheadle area - 400+ houses in the south west out of total allocation. I would question if this number of houses is needed, but if so spread them more evenly to develop all sides of the town. proposed link road ?? Through the estate. Not appropriate for heavy traffic through a residential estate. It would be a waste of time unless the link road continued through the north west up to Leek Road - then this may help to reduce traffic. access road through the railway line would spoil local walking areas. This surely would not be in the interest of public health!! loss of green space and walking areas. no public open spaces in the south west as the 3 large areas on the map are school playing fields and not open to the public - very misleading. increase in traffic. Why build the school in the north and a large proportion of the houses in the south!	• See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding public open space. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.
PO1008	Mrs Laura Cartlidge				CH085A	Object	These comments are in relation to proposals to sites CH085a, CH085b, CH085c and CH085d which are all objected to. a) It remains entirely unclear why and how these sites (and indeed all others) have become 'Preferred Housing Allocation' sites. There are no published criteria for the evaluation of all sites put forward in the Summer 2015 Consultation, nor any available analysis and results of any such evaluation. b) The reduction of agricultural land, and the increase in built development, will have the double effect of significantly increasing surface water run-off to the River Tean. At this point, and below, the River is in an Environment Agency Flood Warning Area, and there has been abundant recent evidence of downstream flooding in Tean. c) There would be	• Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO476 regarding landscape issue and pedestrian links. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4208							a massive reduction in public amenity. The very essence of the value of the Green Belt to the south west of the sites is precisely because it forms part of a valley, with walks and views in both directions. To build over half the valley would detract from the views from the remaining Green Belt land, and would very severely curtail the extremely popular current public access by children and adults for pleasure, dog walking, cycling etc. De facto it is THE public open space for this part of the town (see also q25 above). d) There are significant accessibility problems associated with the sites. Whether a 'potential link road' (will this be subject to a Section 101 Agreement with the developer?) is built, or simply an estate access road, there will be markedly increased traffic on different parts of Tean Road. The large majority of visits from the development to the town centre will be by car, increasing pressure on a road network which is barely able to cope at the moment at peak times. e) The development would add to pressure on schools in the area which are already close to capacity. We note the views of the County Council that an additional primary school will be required in Cheadle, but find it slightly perverse that this should be planned for the northernmost part of the town at the furthest point from the largest 'preferred' development. The 'school run ' will add to the traffic impact on Tean Road and the town centre. f) Similarly the development would add to the pressure on the already overstretched resources of the NHS in Cheadle, eg GP appointment times. g) Finally from a personal point of view, my property currently looks out onto the proposed building site and as such the development would have a high impact on our lives, both in the initial building stage from the huge disruption and later on the outlook from our property which is one of the main reasons we and many of our neighbours bought our properties.	Amenity – issues such as overlooking, screening and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application.
PO7552	Mrs M Campbell				CH085A	Object	Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehicles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.
PO7440	Mr And Mrs A B Lewis				CH085A	Object	I wish,together with my wife, to comment on the draft plans for Cheadle,in particular the plans for housing allocation in the area around Mobberley and the proposed path of a link road from the main Cheadle /Tean Rd. First there is a proposal to build a substantial number of houses in this area bordering on green belt. This is the third time that this part of our town has been subjected to attempts to build. My main objections are in regard to the infrastructure of this area. I am a regular user of the main road between Cheadle and Tean as a runner, on the pavement, and as a motorist. I have previously made complaints to the holder of the highways portfolio on the County Council on the state of this major road out of the town and the accompanying pavement. This road and pavement are a danger to all who have the misfortune to have to use them on a regular basis. The road between the bridge over Cecily brook and Tenford is in an appalling state for a carriageway which is classified as an A road. Large	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4209							vehicles from JCB and other industrial sites in and around Cheadle are constantly trundling up and down this road in both directions breaking up the surface and leaving potholes. When resurfacing work was done a few years back on this road, the work stopped at the bridge for some reason so that the situation has continued to deteriorate. On many occasions I have seen two vehicles travelling in opposite directions barely able to pass each other thereby causing one of them to stop and mount the pavement in order to allow the other to pass. As far as the pavement is concerned the surface is broken all along the stretch between Eaves Lane and Tenford necessitating careful placement of feet even when walking, let alone running. In addition there is all manner of vegetation growing out of the hedgerow reducing the pavement width to less than two feet in places. When I last reported these problems last year a half hearted attempt at improving the pavement was made by cutting back the growth, but of course we are now in the growing season and the situation is as bad if not worse than ever. No work has been carried out on the pavement surface so that it continues to deteriorate. I did suggest that Mr Deaville might like to take a stroll with me along this road so that I could point out the problems as he is obviously unaware of them but there was no response. My point in making the above statement is twofold. If several hundred homes are planned for this part of Cheadle the infrastructure will deteriorate even more with the addition of many more vehicles using the road. Secondly the link road proposal to me seems pointless. In what way is this going to improve the situation. Were it built, the traffic, including the heavy vehicles, would need to access it via the poor road talked about above. Finally you do not show where this road is supposed to go to. It appears to finish in the middle of the proposed housing. In summary then, it appears as if you are proposing a large estate serviced by a major road which has narrow single carriageways and is little more than an old turnpike road with a tarmacked surface. Together with this the heavy vehicles currently using this road would be diverted onto a new link road apparently going nowhere according to the plan. The whole idea as far as we can see beggars belief unless we are missing something patently obvious to everyone else. If so we would be grateful if you could enlighten us.	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7494	Mr Philip Walton				CH085A	Object	Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals.	• See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure, scale and location of development. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The Local Plan also proposes employment sites.
PO8984	Mrs L J Hurst				CH085A	Object	Good agricultural land and a well used footpath, No 16 cuts through this field. The land is used for grazing cattle. Also flood plain needs protecting.	• The land is Agricultural Class 3 Good to Moderate. Data supplied by Natural England indicates that there is a moderate likelihood that the land is best and most versatile land i.e. Class 3a • New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8990	Mr A Brandrick				CH085A	Object	Summary of representation (see attached document) Infrastructure Concerns Any further development would only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion along the A522 route. A traffic survey taken during quiet periods does not reflect the standstill common during rush hour, the effect on emergency services and the general disruption. Stationary traffic enhances pollution and numerous children walking home are exposed to increased pollution. An increase in housing in the SW would add to congested parking in the town centre. The proposed relief road would add to High Street congestion, increase danger to pedestrians, cause a bottleneck where it meets the A521 and through traffic would have to travel along High Street to leave the town. Impact on the need for new school places. current schools are centrally located adding to further congestion. Surely logic would dictate the need for a new school in a different area where new housing could support this. Building in the N and E would relieve the S and centre. Access How will the southern link road cross the dismantled railway? The line owned by Network Rail is leased by Moorlands and City Railway for 15 years. This would not be possible in the immediate and medium term. Flood Risk The recent springs saw unprecedented high levels of floodwater in the proposed southwest development areas. Given the inevitable additional surface water run-off and the new planned developments in Upper Tean, there would be an increased risk of flooding for Upper Tean. Does not the recent government focus on floodplains have an influence upon any consideration to build upon the floodplain margin? Wildlife Abundance of unusual wildlife, voles, kingfishers, owls, bats, house martins, redstarts and buzzards. These would be disturbed and disrupted by proposed developments. Green Areas Where will children play/roam? Where would the public open spaces be? The small green space would be squeezed close to the river. School playing fields are shown as 'public open space' these are not public spaces. Housing Will there be an appropriate percentage of affordable homes for first-time buyers or will it be a series of developments housing middle and high income families, blighting the landscape with three-storey properties?	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The site was subject to a Phase 1 ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' i.e. SBI status. The Phase 1 survey concludes that the site has low potential to support protected species as the habitat is poor and the LWS survey considers that most of the site habitats are common and not considered eligible for SBI status. Both studies recommend further surveys and actions prior to development. • The Council will seek a proportion of affordable housing on the site which meets the required design policies.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9011	Mr B Moreton				CH085A	Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Would take away almost all of the countryside to the SW of Cheadle. Area is devoid of green spaces. Those identified on the map are school playing fields and not available to the public. Overdevelopment in this area. Already an industrial estate, 2 high schools and a sixth form. Smaller areas would be more appropriate. Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle. Sustainability The number of houses proposed would double the amount of housing in the SW. The sites are more than 1km from the town centre making it unlikely that residents would walk to access services and facilities. Not enough dentists. Amenity - Well used footpath crosses site and would be lost if developed. Its development would conflict with the improving health agenda. Flood Risk – sites border the River Tean and will contribute surface water. This will add to flood risk further down stream at Tean. Infrastructure – More school places required. Current schools are located in the centre of Cheadle and cause a huge problem on the surrounding roads with buses, taxis and cars. Potentially another 700 commuter cars will add to this problem. A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options. Government Policy – the Localism Act states that we only need to make housing provision to meet local need. SMDC has a declining population and household projections indicate a demand for 2573 houses not 6000+ that are proposed. This relates to a build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. Landscape – Wardell Armstrong's assessment of visual open space states that there are areas such as this that provide a visual break between areas of development and can enhance the setting of public footpaths and should be protected from development. The area west of Cheadle is identified as an area of landscape enhancement. The wonderful views of Huntley Woods are a great asset to the south of Cheadle.	• See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space and footpaths. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.
CH085B								
PO481	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	CH085B	Support	This site is supported in the initial sustainability appraisal report which considered a south-west focus for new housing development. It is well located in relation to existing services within the town, most of which can be reached by means other than the private motor car. The landowners are willing to consider releasing the land for development initially taking access off the existing highways network.	• Developer support for the site is noted. • There is no current available access to this section of land.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10264	Mrs E Baskeyfield				CH085B	Object	Areas CH085a-d & CH128 are too far from the main infrastructure of the town. They are not near to any publi open spaces as the majority of those on the plan are private field owned by schools and are not for public use. The new housing proposal for the south would increase congestion on the roads especially as the new school is planned for the north of the town. This will causing increased traffic jams on the roads through the town at peak times. The building of houses in this area will increase the water table significantly as the fields are already heavily waterlogged after rain which will have a negative impact on those further down the valley in Tean who have already had areas under water this year due to flooding. Building in this area will on exaserbate this problem.	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding new school . • See response to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO1112	Alan Fox				CH085B	Object	Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife... needs to be expanded to include protected species. i.e Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife including protected species. i.e. bats which have their roosts, along with their foraging and commuting habitats protected by law. I object to the development of this area as it would illegal to destroy the roosts and foraging and commuting habitats of the bats in the area. I have photographs and video of bats foraging in the Aynsley Close area available for any site survey / enquiry. (while they are not of the highest quality they are never the less conclusive.)	• See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology.
PO1376	Mrs H Wordsworth				CH085B	Object	Environmental impact visual landscape and air quality, noise pollution and part of development on a flood plain	• See response to PO476 regarding landscape issue. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO1008 regarding amenity issues.
PO7556	Mrs M Campbell				CH085B	Object	Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehciles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	• See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7443	Mr And Mrs A B Lewis				CH085B	Object	I wish,together with my wife, to comment on the draft plans for Cheadle,in particular the plans for housing allocation in the area around Mobberley and the proposed path of a link road from the main Cheadle /Teon Rd. First there is a proposal to build a substantial number of houses in this area bordering on green belt. This is the third time that this part of our town has been subjected to attempts to build. My main objections are in regard to the infrastructure of this area. I am a regular user of the main road between Cheadle and Tean as a runner, on the pavement, and as a motorist. I have previously made complaints to the holder of the highways portfolio on the County Council on the state of this major road out of the town and the accompanying pavement. This road and pavement are a danger to all who have the misfortune to have to use them on a regular basis. The road between the bridge over Cecily brook and Tenford is in an appalling state for a carriageway which is classified as an A road. Large vehicles from JCB and other industrial sites in and around Cheadle are constantly trundling up and down this road in both directions breaking up the surface and leaving potholes. When resurfacing work was done a few years back on this road, the work stopped at the bridge for some reason so that the situation has continued to deteriorate. On many occasions I have seen two vehicles travelling in opposite directions barely able to pass each other thereby causing one of them to stop and mount the pavement in order to allow the other to pass. As far as the pavement is concerned the surface is broken all along the stretch between Eaves Lane and Tenford necessitating careful placement of feet even when walking, let alone running. In addition there is all manner of vegetation growing out of the hedgerow reducing the pavement width to less than two feet in places. When I last reported these problems last year a half hearted attempt at improving the pavement was made by cutting back the growth, but of course we are now in the growing season and the situation is as bad if not worse than ever. No work has been carried out on the pavement surface so that it continues to deteriorate. I did suggest that Mr Deaville might like to take a stroll with me along this road so that I could point out the problems as he is obviously unaware of them but there was no response. My point in making the above statement is twofold. If several hundred homes are planned for this part of Cheadle the infrastructure will deteriorate even more with the addition of many more vehicles using the road. Secondly the link road proposal to me seems pointless. In what way is this going to improve the situation. Were it built, the traffic, including the heavy vehicles, would need to access it via the poor road talked about above. Finally you do not show where this road is supposed to go to. It appears to finish in the middle of the proposed housing. In summary then, it appears as if you are proposing a large estate serviced by a major road which has narrow single carriageways and is little more than an old turnpike road with a tarmacked surface. Together with this the heavy vehicles currently using this road would be diverted onto a new link road apparently going nowhere according to the plan. The whole idea as far as we can see beggars belief unless we are missing something patently obvious to everyone else. If so we would be grateful if you could enlighten us.	• See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7505	Mr Philip Walton				CH085B	Object	Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals.	• See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure, scale and location of development. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The Local Plan also proposes employment sites.
PO8985	Mrs L J Hurst				CH085B	Object	Good agricultural land, used for grazing cattle. Also flood plain needs protecting.	• See response to PO8984 regarding agricultural land. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8991	Mr A Brandrick				CH085B	Object	Summary of representation (see attached document) Infrastructure Concerns Any further development would only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion along the A522 route. A traffic survey taken during quiet periods does not reflect the standstill common during rush hour, the effect on emergency services and the general disruption. Stationary traffic enhances pollution and numerous children walking home are exposed to increased pollution. An increase in housing in the SW would add to congested parking in the town centre. The proposed relief road would add to High Street congestion, increase danger to pedestrians, cause a bottleneck where it meets the A521 and through traffic would have to travel along High Street to leave the town. Impact on the need for new school places. current schools are centrally located adding to further congestion. Surely logic would dictate the need for a new school in a different area where new housing could support this. Building in the N and E would relieve the S and centre. Access How will the southern link road cross the dismantled railway? The line owned by Network Rail is leased by Moorlands and City Railway for 15 years. This would not be possible in the immediate and medium term. Flood Risk The recent springs saw unprecedented high levels of floodwater in the proposed southwest development areas. Given the inevitable additional surface water run-off and the new planned developments in Upper Tean, there would be an increased risk of flooding for Upper Tean. Does not the recent government focus on floodplains have an influence upon any consideration to build upon the floodplain margin? Wildlife Abundance of unusual wildlife, voles, kingfishers, owls, bats, house martins, redstarts and buzzards. These would be disturbed and disrupted by proposed developments. Green Areas Where will children play/roam? Where would the public open spaces be? The small green space would be squeezed close to the river. School playing fields are shown as 'public open space' these are not public spaces. Housing Will there be an appropriate percentage of affordable homes for first-time buyers or will it be a series of developments housing middle and high income families, blighting the landscape with three-storey properties?	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology. • See response to PO8990 regarding affordable housing and design issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9012	Mr B Moreton				CH085B	Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Would take away almost all of the countryside to the SW of Cheadle. Area is devoid of green spaces. Those identified on the map are school playing fields and not available to the public. Overdevelopment in this area. Already an industrial estate, 2 high schools and a sixth form. Smaller areas would be more appropriate. Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle. Sustainability The number of houses proposed would double the amount of housing in the SW. The sites are more than 1km from the town centre making it unlikely that residents would walk to access services and facilities. Not enough dentists. Amenity - Well used footpath crosses site and would be lost if developed. Its development would conflict with the improving health agenda. Flood Risk – sites border the River Tean and will contribute surface water. This will add to flood risk further down stream at Tean. Infrastructure – More school places required. Current schools are located in the centre of Cheadle and cause a huge problem on the surrounding roads with buses, taxis and cars. Potentially another 700 commuter cars will add to this problem. A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options. Government Policy – the Localism Act states that we only need to make housing provision to meet local need. SMDC has a declining population and household projections indicate a demand for 2573 houses not 6000+ that are proposed. This relates to a build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. Landscape – Wardell Armstrong's assessment of visual open space states that there are areas such as this that provide a visual break between areas of development and can enhance the setting of public footpaths and should be protected from development. The area west of Cheadle is identified as an area of landscape enhancement. The wonderful views of Huntley Woods are a great asset to the south of Cheadle.	• See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space and footpaths. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10257	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				CH085B	Object	In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessible to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availability to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line . This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries.It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances available at that time and the case remains the same to-day.In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school,also most of Cheadle's Industry, Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experiencing problems ? a SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO NOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to join another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerous parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town ?	• See response to PO476 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding pedestrian links. • See response to PO476 regarding development in north Cheadle. • See response to PO476 regarding link road and traffic. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding scale and location of new development.
PO1171	Mr P Beesley				CH085B	Object	This land is flood plain + it is always very well. It has been proved in the past that it is unsuitable for building. Proposed relief road goes nowhere would be better going to link with + if this was built then it might become viable.	• See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road.
CH085C								
PO482	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	CH085C	Support	This site is supported in the initial sustainability appraisal report which considered a south-west focus for new housing development. It is well located in relation to existing services within the town, most of which can be reached by means other than the private motor car. The landowners are willing to consider releasing the land for development initially taking access off the existing highways network.	• Developer support for the site is noted. • There is no current available access to this section of land.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1114	Alan Fox				CH085C	Object	Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife.... needs to be expanded to include protected species. i.e Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife including protected species. i.e. bats which have their roosts, along with their foraging and commuting habitats protected by law. I object to the development of this area as it would illegal to destroy the roosts and foraging and commuting habitats of the bats in the area. I have photographs and video of bats foraging in the Aynsley Close area available for any site survey / enquiry. (while they are not of the highest quality they are never the less conclusive.)	See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology.
PO10265	Mrs E Baskeyfield				CH085C	Object	Areas CH085a-d & CH128 are too far from the main infrastructure of the town. They are not near to any publi open spaces as the majority of those on the plan are private field owned by schools and are not for public use. The new housing proposal for the south would increase congestion on the roads especially as the new school is planned for the north of the town. This will causing increased traffic jams on the roads through the town at peak times. The building of houses in this area will increase the water table significantly as the fields are already heavily waterlogged after rain which will have a negative impact on those further down the valley in Tean who have already had areas under water this year due to flooding. Building in this area will on exaserbate this problem.	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - The Council’s Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Landscape Assessment for this site. It advises that the site is open however long distance views are screened by the railway embankment located to the north and west of the site. Only the north-eastern corner of the site is adjacent to the settlement edge and is otherwise separated by adjacent sites (CH085d). The site should therefore not be developed in isolation. If the adjoining sites are developed first, then CH085c could be considered as a potential development site in a later phase. There could be impacts on local landscape character (medium landscape sensitivity), however site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include phased development (ensuring the site is developed following the development of adjoining sites), limiting building heights and planting in the west of the site and phasing development. - See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. - See response to PO168 regarding new school . - See response to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO396	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				CH085C	Object	Unbalanced development in cheadle area - 400+ houses in te south west out of total allocation. I would question if this number of houses is needed, but if so spread them more evenly to develop all sidesof the town. proposed link road ?? Through the estate. Not appropriate for heavy traffic thourhg a residential estate. It would be a waste of time unless the link road continued through the north west up to leek road - then this may help to reduce traffic. loss of green space and walking arrears. no public open spaces in the south west as the 3 large areas on the map are school playing fields and not open to the public - very misleading. increase in traffic. Why build the scool in the north and a large proprotion of the houses in the south!	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO10265 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. - See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. - See reponse to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO1364	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			CH085C	Object	Map 4.7 - Cheadle - CH85c; CH85d; and, CH128 - preferred housing allocations - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocations, individually and cumulatively, has been assessed in respect of the Grade II listed building Mobberley House. Further information is required.	The Council’s Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that the wider agricultural setting is considered to contribute to the overall significance of the Grade II asset – Mobberley House. This could be mitigated through screening of the southern edge of

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								the site. Development in the site would change a part of the HLC zone CHECZ 8, although for the most part, it would remain unaltered (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010) and the Site is considered suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning.
PO1173	Mr P Beesley				CH085C	Object	This land is flood plain + it is always very well. It has been proved in the past that it is unsuitable for building. Proposed relief road goes nowhere would be better going to link with + if this was built then it might become viable	- See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. - See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road.
PO10266	Mrs E Baskeyfield				CH085D	Object	Areas CH085a-d & CH128 are too far from the main infrastructure of the town. They are not near to any public open spaces as the majority of those on the plan are private field owned by schools and are not for public use. The new housing proposal for the south would increase congestion on the roads especially as the new school is planned for the north of the town. This will causing increased traffic jams on the roads through the town at peak times. The building of houses in this area will increase the water table significantly as the fields are already heavily waterlogged after rain which will have a negative impact on those further down the valley in Tean who have already had areas under water this year due to flooding. Building in this area will on exaserbate this problem.	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO10265 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. - See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. - See response to PO168 regarding new school . - See response to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO7557	Mrs M Campbell				CH085C	Object	Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehicles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.
PO7444	Mr And Mrs A B Lewis				CH085C	Object	I wish,together with my wife, to comment on the draft plans for Cheadle,in particular the plans for housing allocation in the area around Mobberley and the proposed path of a link road from the main Cheadle /Tean Rd. First there is a proposal to build a substantial number of houses in this area bordering on green belt. This is the third time that this part of our town has been subjected to attempts to build. My main objections are in regard to the infrastructure of this area. I am a regular user of the main road between Cheadle and Tean as a runner, on the pavement, and as a motorist. I have previously made complaints to the holder of the highways portfolio on the County Council on the state of this major road out of the town and the accompanying pavement. This road and pavement are a danger to all who have the misfortune to have to use them on a regular basis. The road between the bridge over Cecily brook and Tenford is in an appalling state for a carriageway which is classified as an A road. Large vehicles from JCB and other industrial sites in and around Cheadle are constantly trundling up and down this road in both directions breaking up the surface and leaving potholes. When resurfacing work was done a few years back on this road, the work stopped at the bridge for some reason so that the	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4221							situation has continued to deteriorate. On many occasions I have seen two vehicles travelling in opposite directions barely able to pass each other thereby causing one of them to stop and mount the pavement in order to allow the other to pass. As far as the pavement is concerned the surface is broken all along the stretch between Eaves Lane and Tenford necessitating careful placement of feet even when walking, let alone running. In addition there is all manner of vegetation growing out of the hedgerow reducing the pavement width to less than two feet in places. When I last reported these problems last year a half hearted attempt at improving the pavement was made by cutting back the growth, but of course we are now in the growing season and the situation is as bad if not worse than ever. No work has been carried out on the pavement surface so that it continues to deteriorate. I did suggest that Mr Deaville might like to take a stroll with me along this road so that I could point out the problems as he is obviously unaware of them but there was no response. My point in making the above statement is twofold. If several hundred homes are planned for this part of Cheadle the infrastructure will deteriorate even more with the addition of many more vehicles using the road. Secondly the link road proposal to me seems pointless. In what way is this going to improve the situation. Were it built, the traffic, including the heavy vehicles, would need to access it via the poor road talked about above. Finally you do not show where this road is supposed to go to. It appears to finish in the middle of the proposed housing. In summary then, it appears as if you are proposing a large estate serviced by a major road which has narrow single carriageways and is little more than an old turnpike road with a tarmacked surface. Together with this the heavy vehicles currently using this road would be diverted onto a new link road apparently going nowhere according to the plan. The whole idea as far as we can see beggars belief unless we are missing something patently obvious to everyone else. If so we would be grateful if you could enlighten us.	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7507	Mr Philip Walton				CH085C	Object	Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals.	• See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure, scale and location of development. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The Local Plan also proposes employment sites.
PO8986	Mrs L J Hurst				CH085C	Object	Good agricultural land. Also flood plain needs protecting.	• The land is Agricultural Class 3 Good to Moderate. Data supplied by Natural England indicates that there is a moderate to high likelihood that the land is best and most versatile land i.e. Class 3a. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8992	Mr A Brandrick				CH085C	Object	Summary of representation (see attached document) Infrastructure Concerns Any further development would only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion along the A522 route. A traffic survey taken during quiet periods does not reflect the standstill common during rush hour, the effect on emergency services and the general disruption. Stationary traffic enhances pollution and numerous children walking home are exposed to increased pollution. An increase in housing in the SW would add to congested parking in the town centre. The proposed relief road would add to High Street congestion, increase danger to pedestrians, cause a bottleneck where it meets the A521 and through traffic would have to travel along High Street to leave the town. Impact on the need for new school places. current schools are centrally located adding to further congestion. Surely logic would dictate the need for a new school in a different area where new housing could support this. Building in the N and E would relieve the S and centre. Access How will the southern link road cross the dismantled railway? The line owned by Network Rail is leased by Moorlands and City Railway for 15 years. This would not be possible in the immediate and medium term. Flood Risk The recent springs saw unprecedented high levels of floodwater in the proposed southwest development areas. Given the inevitable additional surface water run-off and the new planned developments in Upper Tean, there would be an increased risk of flooding for Upper Tean. Does not the recent government focus on floodplains have an influence upon any consideration to build upon the floodplain margin? Wildlife Abundance of unusual wildlife, voles, kingfishers, owls, bats, house martins, redstarts and buzzards. These would be disturbed and disrupted by proposed developments. Green Areas Where will children play/roam? Where would the public open spaces be? The small green space would be squeezed close to the river. School playing fields are shown as 'public open space' these are not public spaces. Housing Will there be an appropriate percentage of affordable homes for first-time buyers or will it be a series of developments housing middle and high income families, blighting the landscape with three-storey properties?	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology. • See response to PO8990 regarding affordable housing and design issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9013	Mr B Moreton				CH085C	Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Would take away almost all of the countryside to the SW of Cheadle. Area is devoid of green spaces. Those identified on the map are school playing fields and not available to the public. Overdevelopment in this area. Already an industrial estate, 2 high schools and a sixth form. Smaller areas would be more appropriate. Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle. Sustainability The number of houses proposed would double the amount of housing in the SW. The sites are more than 1km from the town centre making it unlikely that residents would walk to access services and facilities. Not enough dentists. Amenity - Well used footpath crosses site and would be lost if developed. Its development would conflict with the improving health agenda. Flood Risk – sites border the River Tean and will contribute surface water. This will add to flood risk further down stream at Tean. Infrastructure – More school places required. Current schools are located in the centre of Cheadle and cause a huge problem on the surrounding roads with buses, taxis and cars. Potentially another 700 commuter cars will add to this problem. A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options. Government Policy – the Localism Act states that we only need to make housing provision to meet local need. SMDC has a declining population and household projections indicate a demand for 2573 houses not 6000+ that are proposed. This relates to a build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. Landscape – Wardell Armstrong's assessment of visual open space states that there are areas such as this that provide a visual break between areas of development and can enhance the setting of public footpaths and should be protected from development. The area west of Cheadle is identified as an area of landscape enhancement. The wonderful views of Huntley Woods are a great asset to the south of Cheadle.	• See response to PO10265 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO10265 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space and footpaths. • See response to PO1169 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10258	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				CH085C	Object	In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessible to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availability to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line . This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries.It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances available at that time and the case remains the same to-day. In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school, also most of Cheadle's Industry. Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experiencing problems ? a SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO NOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to join another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerous parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town ?	• See response to PO10265 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding pedestrian links. • See response to PO476 regarding development in north Cheadle. • See response to PO476 regarding link road and traffic. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO10265 regarding scale and location of new development.
PO483	Mr T A J Campbell		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	CH085D	Support	This site is supported in the initial sustainability appraisal report which considered a south-west focus for new housing development. It is well located in relation to existing services within the town, most of which can be reached by means other than the private motor car. The landowners are willing to consider releasing the land for development initially taking access off the existing highways network.	• Developer support for the site is noted. • Some housing could be served off Dandillion Avenue and the capacity could be increased if Dandillion Avenue was widened.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7	Mrs Desiree Billington				CH085D	Object	We used to live and work in the heart of the West Midlands (the Black Country). A large urban sprawl and often very congested. After taking early retirement, in 2012, we chose to live in Cheadle, it being a very pleasant semi rural market town. Cheadle has the correct amount of properties and population to make it a very nice and friendly place to live. It does have its problems, it can get very congested at school times and morning and evening rush hour. In particular in the town centre and Tean Road. Tape Street is also a big problem having 3 sets of pedestrian crossing lights which causes tailbacks at certain times. No one wants any more building in Cheadle. There is not enough infrastructure to cope with an extra influx of people. Roads certainly cannot cope with more traffic. On a personal note, we do not want any more houses near to our property as this will cause noise pollution, obstruct our current views, invade our privacy, cause havoc to wildlife and maybe even cause environmental problems such as flooding, ie: houses being built on farm land which currently has good rain water drainage. Cheadle council need to think seriously about the upset and problems they are like to cause if they go ahead with a ludicrous idea of excess building anywhere in the town.	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO1008 regarding amenity issues. • See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology. • The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. Any application would be accompanied by an FRA which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that neighbouring areas are not affected.
PO1115	Alan Fox				CH085D	Object	Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife..... needs to be expanded to include protected species. i.e Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife from the area. Site is abundant in wildlife including protected species. i.e. bats which have their roosts, along with their foraging and commuting habitats protected by law. I object to the development of this area as it would be illegal to destroy the roosts and foraging and commuting habitats of the bats in the area. I have photographs and video of bats foraging in the Aynsley Close area available for any site survey / enquiry. (while they are not of the highest quality they are never the less conclusive.)	• See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology.
PO398	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				CH085D	Object	Unbalanced development in Cheadle area - 400+ houses in the south west out of total allocation. I would question if this number of houses is needed, but if so spread them more evenly to develop all sides of the town. proposed link road ?? Through the estate. Not appropriate for heavy traffic through a residential estate. It would be a waste of time unless the link road continued through the north west up to Leek Road - then this may help to reduce traffic. loss of green space and walking areas - not in the interest of public health! no public open spaces in the south west as the 3 large areas on the map are school playing fields and not open to the public - very misleading. increase in traffic. Why build the school in the north and a large proportion of the houses in the south! reduced standard of living and quality of life to current residents in the south west due to unbalanced development which will increase traffic, noise, pollution.	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) includes a Landscape Assessment for this site. It advises that the site comprises generally flat fields enclosed by residential development to the east and north. The site is open to the west however long distance views are screened by the railway embankment located further to the west of the site. Site fits in well with the existing settlement pattern as it does not extend beyond the existing western settlement edge formed by Draycott Drive and Carleton Drive. Planting could be undertaken on the western boundary in order to create a vegetated edge to the settlement. (low landscape sensitivity). • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO168 regarding public open space.
PO1377	Mrs H Wordsworth				CH085D	Object	environmental impact on visual landscape noise pollution and air quality	• See response to PO398 regarding visual impact. • See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO1008 regarding amenity issues.
PO1365	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			CH085D	Object	Map 4.7 - Cheadle - CH85c; CH85d; and, CH128 - preferred housing allocations - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocations, individually and cumulatively, has been assessed in respect of the Grade II listed building Mobberley House. Further information is required.	• The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that the wider agricultural setting is considered to contribute to the overall significance of the Grade II asset – Mobberley House.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								This could be mitigated through screening of the southern edge of the site. Development in the site would change a part of the HLC zone CHECZ 8, although for the most part, it would remain unaltered (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010) and the Site is considered suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning.
PO1234	Mr David Billington				CH085D	Object	No comments made	-
PO821	Mr Alan Donaldson				CH085D	Object	Any houses built in this area will result in potentially hundreds of additional vehicles joining the Tean Road which already has problems with either vehicles heading into town blocking the road as they queue to enter the unsatisfactory road system through the town, or going away from Cheadle will cause more problems in Tean. Any by-pass will simply result in vehicles going to the west of town and trying to enter the one way system or create further congestion at the T junction in Foresbrook/Blythe Bridge. Schools, Drs, and infra-structure is already inadequate without further development. Further development will cause more surface water which from the proposed area CH085D will flow down to Tean, which already experiences flooding. This area has been the boundary for housing development for nearly 50 years and consideration should be given to the quantity and type of housing that is being proposed and should include public open spaces as there are none at all on this side of the Tean Road. The scale of the proposed development is out of balance with the infra structure and employment opportunities that already exist.	- See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO398 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. - See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. - A public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and where new public open space is required.
PO1175	Mr P Beesley				CH085D	Object	This land is flood plain + it is always very well. It has been proved in the past that it is unsuitable for building. Proposed relief road goes nowhere would be better going to link with + if this was built then it might become viable	- See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. - See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road.
PO7559	Mrs M Campbell				CH085D	Object	Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehicles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.
PO7446	Mr And Mrs A B Lewis				CH085D	Object	I wish, together with my wife, to comment on the draft plans for Cheadle, in particular the plans for housing allocation in the area around Mobberley and the proposed path of a link road from the main Cheadle /Tean Rd. First there is a proposal to build a substantial number of houses in this area bordering on green belt. This is the third time that this part of our town has been subjected to attempts to build. My main objections are in regard to the infrastructure of this area. I am a regular user of the main road between Cheadle and Tean as a runner, on the pavement, and as a motorist. I have previously made complaints to the holder of the highways portfolio on the County Council on the state of this major road out of the town and the accompanying pavement. This road and pavement are a danger to all who have the misfortune to have to use them on a regular basis. The road between the bridge over Cecily brook and Tenford is in an appalling state for a carriageway which is classified as an A road. Large	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4228							vehicles from JCB and other industrial sites in and around Cheadle are constantly trundling up and down this road in both directions breaking up the surface and leaving potholes. When resurfacing work was done a few years back on this road, the work stopped at the bridge for some reason so that the situation has continued to deteriorate. On many occasions I have seen two vehicles travelling in opposite directions barely able to pass each other thereby causing one of them to stop and mount the pavement in order to allow the other to pass. As far as the pavement is concerned the surface is broken all along the stretch between Eaves Lane and Tenford necessitating careful placement of feet even when walking, let alone running. In addition there is all manner of vegetation growing out of the hedgerow reducing the pavement width to less than two feet in places. When I last reported these problems last year a half hearted attempt at improving the pavement was made by cutting back the growth, but of course we are now in the growing season and the situation is as bad if not worse than ever. No work has been carried out on the pavement surface so that it continues to deteriorate. I did suggest that Mr Deaville might like to take a stroll with me along this road so that I could point out the problems as he is obviously unaware of them but there was no response. My point in making the above statement is twofold. If several hundred homes are planned for this part of Cheadle the infrastructure will deteriorate even more with the addition of many more vehicles using the road. Secondly the link road proposal to me seems pointless. In what way is this going to improve the situation. Were it built, the traffic, including the heavy vehicles, would need to access it via the poor road talked about above. Finally you do not show where this road is supposed to go to. It appears to finish in the middle of the proposed housing. In summary then, it appears as if you are proposing a large estate serviced by a major road which has narrow single carriageways and is little more than an old turnpike road with a tarmacked surface. Together with this the heavy vehicles currently using this road would be diverted onto a new link road apparently going nowhere according to the plan. The whole idea as far as we can see beggars belief unless we are missing something patently obvious to everyone else. If so we would be grateful if you could enlighten us.	

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8993	Mr A Brandrick				CH085D	Object	Summary of representation (see attached document) Infrastructure Concerns Any further development would only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion along the A522 route. A traffic survey taken during quiet periods does not reflect the standstill common during rush hour, the effect on emergency services and the general disruption. Stationary traffic enhances pollution and numerous children walking home are exposed to increased pollution. An increase in housing in the SW would add to congested parking in the town centre. The proposed relief road would add to High Street congestion, increase danger to pedestrians, cause a bottleneck where it meets the A521 and through traffic would have to travel along High Street to leave the town. Impact on the need for new school places. current schools are centrally located adding to further congestion. Surely logic would dictate the need for a new school in a different area where new housing could support this. Building in the N and E would relieve the S and centre. Access How will the southern link road cross the dismantled railway? The line owned by Network Rail is leased by Moorlands and City Railway for 15 years. This would not be possible in the immediate and medium term. Flood Risk The recent springs saw unprecedented high levels of floodwater in the proposed southwest development areas. Given the inevitable additional surface water run-off and the new planned developments in Upper Tean, there would be an increased risk of flooding for Upper Tean. Does not the recent government focus on floodplains have an influence upon any consideration to build upon the floodplain margin? Wildlife Abundance of unusual wildlife, voles, kingfishers, owls, bats, house martins, redstarts and buzzards. These would be disturbed and disrupted by proposed developments. Green Areas Where will children play/roam? Where would the public open spaces be? The small green space would be squeezed close to the river. School playing fields are shown as 'public open space' these are not public spaces. Housing Will there be an appropriate percentage of affordable homes for first-time buyers or will it be a series of developments housing middle and high income families, blighting the landscape with three-storey properties?	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • See response to PO8990 regarding wildlife and ecology. • See response to PO8990 regarding affordable housing and design issues.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7510	Mr Philip Walton				CH085D	Object	Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals.	• See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure, scale and location of development. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The Local Plan also proposes employment sites.
PO3265	Mrs J.F. Eaton				CH085d	Object	S/W area on the map open spaces are not open they are open playing fields. Nearly 500 houses in 1 area cannot be right it is total overload. Tean Road is already congested without more traffic we moved to Draycott Drive because it was nice & quiet it won't be nice and quiet with all the houses behind it and the extra traffic.	• See response to PO168 regarding open space. • See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding scale of development.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9014	Mr B Moreton				CH085D	Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Would take away almost all of the countryside to the SW of Cheadle. Area is devoid of green spaces. Those identified on the map are school playing fields and not available to the public. Overdevelopment in this area. Already an industrial estate, 2 high schools and a sixth form. Smaller areas would be more appropriate. Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle. Sustainability The number of houses proposed would double the amount of housing in the SW. The sites are more than 1km from the town centre making it unlikely that residents would walk to access services and facilities. Not enough dentists. Amenity - Well used footpath crosses site and would be lost if developed. Its development would conflict with the improving health agenda. Flood Risk – sites border the River Tean and will contribute surface water. This will add to flood risk further down stream at Tean. Infrastructure – More school places required. Current schools are located in the centre of Cheadle and cause a huge problem on the surrounding roads with buses, taxis and cars. Potentially another 700 commuter cars will add to this problem. A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options. Government Policy – the Localism Act states that we only need to make housing provision to meet local need. SMDC has a declining population and household projections indicate a demand for 2573 houses not 6000+ that are proposed. This relates to a build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. Landscape – Wardell Armstrong's assessment of visual open space states that there are areas such as this that provide a visual break between areas of development and can enhance the setting of public footpaths and should be protected from development. The area west of Cheadle is identified as an area of landscape enhancement. The wonderful views of Huntley Woods are a great asset to the south of Cheadle.	• See response to PO476 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO398 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space and footpaths. • See response to PO7 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10260	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				CH085D	Object	In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessible to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availability to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line . This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries.It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances available at that time and the case remains the same to-day. In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school, also most of Cheadle's Industry, Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experiencing problems ? a SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO NOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to join another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerous parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town ?	• See response to PO398 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding pedestrian links. • See response to PO476 regarding development in north Cheadle. • See response to PO476 regarding link road and traffic. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding scale and location of new development.
CH128								
PO1366	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			CH128	Object	Map 4.7 - Cheadle - CH85c; CH85d; and, CH128 - preferred housing allocations - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocations, individually and cumulatively, has been assessed in respect of the Grade II listed building Mobberley House. Further information is required.	• The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that there are two Grade II Listed Buildings within 400m which are well screened by vegetation. Due to the topography and existing vegetation, development would be unlikely to cause high adverse effects to the settings of the assets. Mitigation could include screening of the eastern and southern edges to reduce effects. Development in the site would change a small element of the HLC zone CHECZ 8, although for the most part, it would remain

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								unaltered (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010) and the Site is considered suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning.
PO1176	Mr P Beesley				CH128	Object	This land is flood plain + it is always very well. It has been proved in the past that it is unsuitable for building. Proposed relief road goes nowhere would be better going to link with + if this was built then it might become viable	- The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. Any application would be accompanied by an FRA which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that neighbouring areas are not affected. - See response to PO476 regarding the proposed link road and access.
PO7560	Mrs M Campbell				CH128	Object	Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehicles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	- See response to PO476 regarding the proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.
PO7448	Mr And Mrs A B Lewis				CH128	Object	We wish to comment on the draft plans for Cheadle, in particular the plans for housing allocation in the area around Mobberley and the proposed path of a link road from the main Cheadle /Tean Rd. First there is a proposal to build a substantial number of houses in this area bordering on green belt. This is the third time that this part of our town has been subjected to attempts to build. My main objections are in regard to the infrastructure of this area. I am a regular user of the main road between Cheadle and Tean as a runner, on the pavement, and as a motorist. I have previously made complaints to the holder of the highways portfolio on the County Council on the state of this major road out of the town and the accompanying pavement. This road and pavement are a danger to all who have the misfortune to have to use them on a regular basis. The road between the bridge over Cecily brook and Tenford is in an appalling state for a carriageway which is classified as an A road. Large vehicles from JCB and other industrial sites in and around Cheadle are constantly trundling up and down this road in both directions breaking up the surface and leaving potholes. When resurfacing work was done a few years back on this road, the work stopped at the bridge for some reason so that the situation has continued to deteriorate. On many occasions I have seen two vehicles travelling in opposite directions barely able to pass each other thereby causing one of them to stop and mount the pavement in order to allow the other to pass. As far as the pavement is concerned the surface is broken all along the stretch between Eaves Lane and Tenford necessitating careful placement of feet even when walking, let alone running. In addition there is all manner of vegetation growing out of the hedgerow reducing the pavement width to less than two feet in places. When I last reported these problems last year a half hearted attempt at improving the pavement was made by cutting back the growth, but of course we are now in the growing season and the situation is as bad if not worse than ever. No work has been carried out on the pavement surface so that it continues to deteriorate. I did suggest that Mr Deaville might like to take a stroll with me along this road so that I could point out the problems as he is	- See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. - See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							obviously unaware of them but there was no response. My point in making the above statement is twofold. If several hundred homes are planned for this part of Cheadle the infrastructure will deteriorate even more with the addition of many more vehicles using the road. Secondly the link road proposal to me seems pointless. In what way is this going to improve the situation. Were it built, the traffic, including the heavy vehicles, would need to access it via the poor road talked about above. Finally you do not show where this road is supposed to go to. It appears to finish in the middle of the proposed housing. In summary then, it appears as if you are proposing a large estate serviced by a major road which has narrow single carriageways and is little more than an old turnpike road with a tarmacked surface. Together with this the heavy vehicles currently using this road would be diverted onto a new link road apparently going nowhere according to the plan. The whole idea as far as we can see beggars belief unless we are missing something patently obvious to everyone else. If so we would be grateful if you could enlighten us.	
PO8988	Mrs L J Hurst				CH128	Object	This area of land has suddenly appeared on the map. It hasn't shown on previous ones! But it's suddenly become available for one purpose and that is as an access for areas CH085a, CH085b, CH085c and CH085d. How very convenient! But what a dangerous location for such a junction. Please leave well alone.	See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues.
PO10267	Mrs E Baskeyfield				Ch128	Object	Areas CH085a-d & CH128 are too far from the main infrastructure of the town. They are not near to any public open spaces as the majority of those on the plan are private field owned by schools and are not for public use. The new housing proposal for the south would increase congestion on the roads especially as the new school is planned for the north of the town. This will causing increased traffic jams on the roads through the town at peak times. The building of houses in this area will increase the water table significantly as the fields are already heavily waterlogged after rain which will have a negative impact on those further down the valley in Tean who have already had areas under water this year due to flooding. Building in this area will exacerbate this problem.	- The Council has considered a number of sites within and on the edge of Cheadle. There is not enough brownfield land or sites to meet the District's proposed housing requirement within the built up area of the town. This site is located on the edge of the settlement within the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review Study (Nov 2015) considers the overall impact on the Green Belt to be limited and site CH128 could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances with an amendment to the Green Belt. It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space. Distance from the town centre needs to be balanced with other considerations such as landscape impact, viability and deliverability. - See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO1176 regarding flood risk issues. - See response to PO168 regarding new school. - See response to PO168 regarding public open space.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8994	Mr A Brandrick				CH128	Object	Summary of representation (see attached document) Infrastructure Concerns Any further development would only exacerbate the existing traffic congestion along the A522 route. A traffic survey taken during quiet periods does not reflect the standstill common during rush hour, the effect on emergency services and the general disruption. Stationary traffic enhances pollution and numerous children walking home are exposed to increased pollution. An increase in housing in the SW would add to congested parking in the town centre. The proposed relief road would add to High Street congestion, increase danger to pedestrians, cause a bottleneck where it meets the A521 and through traffic would have to travel along High Street to leave the town. Impact on the need for new school places. current schools are centrally located adding to further congestion. Surely logic would dictate the need for a new school in a different area where new housing could support this. Building in the N and E would relieve the S and centre. Access How will the southern link road cross the dismantled railway? The line owned by Network Rail is leased by Moorlands and City Railway for 15 years. This would not be possible in the immediate and medium term. Flood Risk The recent springs saw unprecedented high levels of floodwater in the proposed southwest development areas. Given the inevitable additional surface water run-off and the new planned developments in Upper Tean, there would be an increased risk of flooding for Upper Tean. Does not the recent government focus on floodplains have an influence upon any consideration to build upon the floodplain margin? Wildlife Abundance of unusual wildlife, voles, kingfishers, owls, bats, house martins, redstarts and buzzards. These would be disturbed and disrupted by proposed developments. Green Areas Where will children play/roam? Where would the public open spaces be? The small green space would be squeezed close to the river. School playing fields are shown as 'public open space' these are not public spaces. Housing Will there be an appropriate percentage of affordable homes for first-time buyers or will it be a series of developments housing middle and high income families, blighting the landscape with three-storey properties?	• See response to PO476 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school. • See response to PO1176 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • See response to PO8990 regarding affordable housing and design issues. • The site was subject to a Phase 1 ecological survey in 2014 and a later 2016 ecology study considered the scope for 'local wildlife site' i.e. SBI status. The Phase 1 survey concludes that the site has low potential to support protected species as the habitat is poor and the LWS survey considers that most of the site habitats are common and not considered eligible for SBI status. Recommended that vegetation is removed at an appropriate time of year.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7511	Mr Philip Walton				CH128	Object	Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals.	• See response to PO10267 regarding infrastructure, scale and location of development. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road and traffic issues. • See response to PO1176 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. The Local Plan also proposes employment sites.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9016	Mr B Moreton				CH128	Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Would take away almost all of the countryside to the SW of Cheadle. Area is devoid of green spaces. Those identified on the map are school playing fields and not available to the public. Overdevelopment in this area. Already an industrial estate, 2 high schools and a sixth form. Smaller areas would be more appropriate. Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle. Sustainability The number of houses proposed would double the amount of housing in the SW. The sites are more than 1km from the town centre making it unlikely that residents would walk to access services and facilities. Not enough dentists. Amenity - Well used footpath crosses site and would be lost if developed. Its development would conflict with the improving health agenda. Flood Risk – sites border the River Tean and will contribute surface water. This will add to flood risk further down stream at Tean. Infrastructure – More school places required. Current schools are located in the centre of Cheadle and cause a huge problem on the surrounding roads with buses, taxis and cars. Potentially another 700 commuter cars will add to this problem. A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options. Government Policy – the Localism Act states that we only need to make housing provision to meet local need. SMDC has a declining population and household projections indicate a demand for 2573 houses not 6000+ that are proposed. This relates to a build rate of 171.5 dwellings per annum. Landscape – Wardell Armstrong's assessment of visual open space states that there are areas such as this that provide a visual break between areas of development and can enhance the setting of public footpaths and should be protected from development. The area west of Cheadle is identified as an area of landscape enhancement. The wonderful views of Huntley Woods are a great asset to the south of Cheadle.	• The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Landscape Assessment for this site. It advises that the site comprises generally flat fields enclosed by residential development to the east and north. The site is open to the west however long distance views are screened by the railway embankment located further to the west of the site. Site fits in well with the existing settlement pattern as it does not extend beyond the existing western settlement edge formed by Draycott Drive and Carleton Drive. Planting could be undertaken on the western boundary in order to create a vegetated edge to the settlement. (low landscape sensitivity). • See response to PO10267 regarding scale of development and infrastructure. • See response to PO476 regarding proposed link road. • See response to PO168 and PO476 regarding public open space and footpaths. • See response to PO1176 regarding flood risk issues. • See response to PO168 regarding proposed new school.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? Mobberley Sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10259	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				CH128	Object	In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessible to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availability to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line . This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries.It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances availableat that time and the case remains the same to-day.In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school,also most of Cheadle's Industry, Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experienceing problems ? a SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO NOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to ajoin another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerouse parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town ?	• See response to PO9016 regarding landscape issues. • See response to PO476 regarding pedestrian links. • See response to PO476 regarding development in north Cheadle. • See response to PO476 regarding link road and traffic. • See response to PO476 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO10267 regarding scale and location of new development.

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? New allocations – within the urban area

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
CH002A								
PO2597	Consultation Service	Natural England			CH002A	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Cheadle. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors around the towns and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the planning application stage. Similarly, a public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this. The Council has also designated Local Green Spaces in line with criteria set out in the NPPF and the Council will seek to facilitate improvements to these areas where required.
CH002B								
PO2598	Consultation Service	Natural England			CH002B	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Cheadle. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	See response to PO2597 regarding green infrastructure.
CH009								
PO2596	Consultation Service	Natural England			CH009	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Cheadle. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	See response to PO2597 regarding green infrastructure.
CH015								
PO1363	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			CH015	Object	Map 4.7 - Cheadle - CH015 - preferred housing allocation - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation has been assessed in respect of the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings, including setting. Further information is required.	- The site consists of previously developed land including a depot, and is adjacent to the Conservation Area and opposite two Grade II Listed Buildings. - The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that the present site does not contribute to the setting of the heritage assets and

Question 28 – Do you have any comments on the proposed housing allocations in Cheadle? New allocations – within the urban area

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Ref	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								appropriate development could enhance the frontage with sensitive design. It stated that development in this area would be highly unlikely to adversely affect HUCA 5 (Cheadle Extensive Urban Survey report 2012) and the Site is suitable for development in heritage terms with appropriate masterplanning.
PO2798	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			CH015	General comment	CH015: This site is located within Source Protection Zone 2, and partially within Source Protection Zone 1. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place within Source Protection Zone 1. For example we would object to any storage of hazardous substances and would only permit the discharge to ground of clean roof water in Source Protection Zone 1. This site also appears to be Brownfield.	- The site consists of previously developed land including a depot. - Note comments regarding the site being located within Source Protection Zones 1 & 2.
PO6883	Unknown	Stoddards Ltd	Mr G Willard		CH015		These comments relate mainly to site CH015. The site is presently occupied by a commercial garage with linked dwelling to the rear of it. The site is within a single family ownership and its is free of a legal impediment that might hinder its delivery. Land and property prices in Cheadle are constrained and will be likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. This means that the 'value' of this site for residential purposes can only be realised as and when the site owner wishes to or is able to relocate or to close their business. There is at present no clear date in mind as to when this might be but it is highly likely that the site owner will review the business case following allocation of this site for housing purposes. It is highly likely too that the costs of clearing this site and preparing it for residential development will be factor highly in their deliberations and this will have serious implication for site and development viability. The Council will greatly assist the delivery of this site if any allocation implicitly accepts that the site will be unlikely to be able to contribute to affordable housing or other community works due to the high costs of site clearance and preparation and that any application which is supported by a robust viability appraisal which evidences this will be supported in principle. Without such a helpful statement enshrined within the site allocations plan and/or linked policies it may be the case that the development and delivery of the site for housing does not advance beyond the policy provision.	- Developer support for the site is noted. - The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
CH024								
PO2599	Consultation Service	Natural England			CH024	General comment	Natural England notes the proposed preferred site for allocation in Cheadle. We note that it is located close to and/or adjoining existing areas of open space and green infrastructure. Suitable enhancements of existing open spaces' may be required together with appropriate management (and funding thereof) in order to allow these open spaces to function effectively during the local plan period. Similarly the development of these preferred sites (if progressed) will need to include suitable multi-functional green infrastructure. Adopted local plan spatial objectives SO8 & 9 refer together with policies such as DC1 Design Considerations, DC3 landscape and settlement setting, and C3 Green Infrastructure.	See response to PO2597 regarding green infrastructure.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2856	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			Support	In Cheadle we acknowledge the allocation of a site for a new Primary School. The proposed location will provide for a good spread of provision across the town.	Support noted.
PO6917		Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	Support	The Council has proposed site CH132 as a preferred allocation for Cheadle for 80 dwellings. This forms part of a wider urban extension (along with CH001) for the north of Cheadle for around 320 dwellings. Mosaic considers that this represents a logical and deliverable solution to meet a significant proportion of the town's needs, which is welcomed as part of the PSA. As illustrated on the plan supporting the allocation, the Council has indicated that the site could provide a location for a new primary school in addition to residential uses. This position has been confirmed with Staffordshire County Council and it is considered that as part of the wider masterplan for the site, land can be safeguarded for the Council to bring forward a new primary school in line with evidence of need. The figure of 80 dwellings on the site was proposed by Mosaic as part of discussions with the Council however, reflecting the comments above, Mosaic consider it appropriate for the Council to present this figure as a minimum, if it is decided that the site could deliver additional dwellings, or the County Council take the decision that a new school site would be better located elsewhere. Mosaic welcomes the Council's inclusion of site CH132 as part of a wider allocation to the north of Cheadle. The information submitted as part of the 2014 Delivery Document to the Council includes evidence and a strategy of how the site can be delivered which addresses the concerns raised as part of the earlier consultation and is capable of assisting the County Council in finding land for a new primary school.	Support for safeguarding land for a new primary school as part of a wider masterplan for the site is noted.
PO170	Mrs E Baskeyfield				Support	I support the building of a new school further out of the main town centre however it will not reduce congestion if the proposed housing provision is in the south. This will mean that new comers will have to travel across town to get to the school. It would make more sense to have the housing provision in the north will good links off the main road so that people can access JCB or Stoke-on-Trent.	- The proposed new school is planned to serve the north of Cheadle and could therefore reduce school traffic currently accessing schools in the SW of the town. The Highways Authority has not raised any objections to the provision of a new primary school in this location. - New housing development is also proposed in the north of the town. There are existing schools located in the SW of Cheadle to meet the needs of residents located in the south of the town.
PO1007	Mrs Laura Cartlidge				Object	The development would add to the pressure on schools in the area which are already close to capacity. We note the views of the County Council that an additional primary school will be required in Cheadle, but find it slightly perverse that this should be planned for the northernmost part of the town at the furthest point from the largest 'preferred' development. The 'school run' will add to the traffic impact on Tean Road and the town centre.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1378	Mr Price				Object	I believe a better location for the school would be in the south west of Ch085 near the proposed new link road. This would be more accessible to the majority of the population. It would also be exacerbating the Froghall Road/Leek Road. Bottle neck junction which is likely to get worse with the additional housing proposals in the Froghall Road area, development at JCB complex in Leek Road and also developments likely to take place at the former bottoms copper works in Froghall at the former Copper bottom works all of which will add traffic to this road	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO2848	mr michael tunnicliffe				Object	If we are to have more houses, I feel that the most appropriate location would be land from Brook houses to Mobberley including a relief road which would have little impact on the Town Centre, impact may ease the problems there.	Comments noted.
PO822	Mr Alan Donaldson				Object	Yes we object to the location of a new school simply due to the additional travel congestion this will cause on roads that cannot deal with the level of traffic that it currently has.	See response to PO170 regarding traffic and access.
PO2807	A Brattley				Object	I don't believe there should be any more in any large numbers in Cheadle area there are housing estates on most of the roads in and out of Cheadle more than enough considering the employment situation in the town. So build a school the other side of town from other schools is only going to result in more traffic around Cheadle which as more than enough traffic already.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO1508 PO1502 PO1516 PO1531	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor				Object	CH001/CH132 There are more suitable locations for a school site. The reality is that few pupils actually walk to school these days, they are dropped off by parents using their cars whilst commuting to work. Some are just driven to the school and then the parents drive back home afterwards. The congestion around the existing schools in Cheadle is considerable and a different site should be chosen that would minimize the impact upon residents, the current nominated site would cause maximum adverse impact upon residents and road structure.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO2548	Mrs Karen Green				Support	A different area of Cheadle could be this area if allocated for a new primary school could serve Cheadle by making the distance shorter taking pressure of existing infrastructure as at present the primary schools are centralised. The class sizes could be affected and if numbers of children per class are reduced then surely this would be better for the town as a whole. Better for some families, than the current positions of primary schools	Support noted.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2733 PO2745 PO2741 PO2762 PO2679 PO3012 PO2675 PO3017 PO2658 PO2892 PO2874 PO2758 PO2666 PO2720 PO2654 PO2973 PO3008 PO3003 PO2693 PO2712 PO2641 PO2606 PO2610 PO2937	Mr R Snow Mrs V Weston Mr J Weston Mrs J Weston Mr A Hide Mrs J Foster Mrs D Hide Cllr H Lingard Mr R Owen-Jones Mr Alan Moss Mrs Margaret Moss Mr Andrew Weston Mr Christopher Alcock Mr Albert Allen Mrs Lara Austin Mr Jason Baggley Mr Desmond Barnes Mrs Sylvia Barnes Mr Eric Cartlidge Mr Karen Cartlidge Mrs Carole Edwards Mr Michael Feather Mr Angeal Feather Mr Barry Fraser				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable.	• Site CH024 was previously earmarked for a school in the 1998 Local Plan. Site CH009 was not included within this area. Access to the site was subsequently acquired to serve the adjacent factory and the remaining part of CH024 became landlocked. • Staffordshire County Council support the preferred location for the new school and consider it provides for a good spread of provision around the town. In terms of spatial distribution the location of the previous site and the preferred site are close together. No housing allocations are proposed on the east of Cheadle and therefore it is not the most sustainable location for a new school. • Staffordshire County Council estimate that 1.2 ha is require to deliver a 1 Form Entry school. Site CH024 is surrounded by existing development and would be unlikely to accommodate any further expansion. • The previous site has a limited frontage and offers less opportunity to arrange the school access and how the building fits within the street scene. It also is surrounded by residential streets and may lead to residential amenity issues during the school run. The preferred site can be accommodated into the estate in such a way to design out such issues. • The previous site has good access on foot although some of the routes from residential areas lead through areas that are not overlooked. The preferred school site can have access designed and delivered to the most appropriate standard. • The delivery of a new school will need to be funded by developer contributions and the cost will include land acquisition and building costs. The inclusion of safeguarded land for a school as part of a wider masterplan means that the school is likely to be deliverable and appropriately designed.

Page 4243

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2621 PO2937 PO2932 PO2983 PO2716 PO2968 PO2737 PO2788 PO2812 PO2767 PO2775 PO2988 PO2826 PO2671 PO2836 PO2646 PO2670 PO2754 PO2633 PO2725 PO2614 PO2662 PO2637 PO2729 PO2684 PO2688 PO2627 PO2750 PO3296 PO3301 PO3392 PO3032 PO3250 PO3425 PO3433 PO3416 PO3321 PO3313 PO3377 PO3384 PO3328 PO3393 PO3424 PO3361	Mr Damien Flynn Mr Barry Fraser Mrs Catherine Fraser Mr Ronald Fryer Mr Andrew Gibson M Glover Mrs Karen Green Miss Angela Gregory Mrs Vera James Mrs H Keeling Mr Stefan Lilleker Mr Ian Menzies Lingard Mrs B Massey Mr Gareth Owen-Jones Mrs Christine Pickin Mr And Mrs T & J Prince Miss Lynne Sanders Mr Oliver Weston Mrs Rosemarie Green Mr John Elks Mrs Ena Wetwood Mr A Emery Mr Clive Green Mrs Mavis Elks Mr Philip Simcock Ms Marie Kennaway Mrs J Whitefield Mr D Weston Mrs J Birks Mr M Birks Helen Abbey Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson K W Alcock Mr Craig Beardmore Mrs Christine Broad Mr Basil Brunt Mr Peter Brunt Mrs Hazel Brunt Mr Stanley Byatt Mrs Vera Byatt Mrs Jill Callear Miss L Chadwick Mrs Maureen Clewes Mr Harvey Cope					Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3435 PO3255 PO3047 PO3042 PO2942 PO2771 PO3098 PO2866 PO3022 PO2978 PO2797 PO3260 PO2957 PO2904 PO2962 PO3027 PO2993 PO2998 PO2952 PO2842 PO3037 PO3103 PO3140 PO3052 PO3244 PO3135 PO3145 PO3234 PO3150 PO3088 PO3130 PO3165 PO3125 PO3160 PO3155 PO3170 PO3239 PO3211 PO3083 PO3206	Mr George Davall Mr Roger Davis Mrs Eva Moulton Mr K G Moulton D Pittman Mrs K Rogers Mrs J Seddon Mrs Dorothy Tunnicliffe Mr D Waring Mrs Susan Wiseman Mrs Florence Worsley Mr A.R. Eaton Mrs Patricia Griffiths Mr Raymond James Mr John Shipley Mrs Angela Jones Mr Michael Sposito Elvira Sposito Mr Ronald Griffiths Mrs Hazel Simcock Mrs Susan Clare Mr D Gould Mr And Mrs J Greenwood Mr A Shenton Mr C Smith Mr N Watson Mrs J Davies Mrs M Snow Mrs J Titterton Mrs B Barks Mr A Ainsworth Mr D Ainsworth Mr G Clewlow Mr D Dunn Mrs P Dunn Mr D Ratcliffe Mr R Lees Mr R Ball Mr A Hewitt Mr J Hewitt				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. It seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3201 PO3196 PO3191 PO3186 PO3078 PO3073 PO3068 PO3181 PO3063 PO3175 PO3058 PO3228 PO3108 PO3114 PO3119 PO3223 PO3546 PO3535 PO3581 PO3664 PO3605 PO3574 PO3588 PO3458 PO3451 PO3629 PO3628 PO3466 PO3459 PO3604 PO3442 PO3504 PO3503 PO3575 PO3589 PO3521 PO3491 PO3353 PO3512 PO3636	Miss K Pickford-Avery Mrs P Routledge Mrs A Rogers Miss S Ford Ms J Croft Mr W Wordsworth Mr J Lawler Mrs P Wordsworth Mr C Foster Mr P Hollywood Mrs A Hollywood Mr N Hewitt Mr I Millward Miss P Millward Mr B Clare Mr P Heath Mrs Michelle Plant Mr Lee Plant Ms Gina Boston K W Alcock Mrs Patricia Allum Mr Lee Austin Mr Matthew Boston Mrs Susan Brindley Mrs Sally Broadley Mr Neville Brooks Mrs Pauline Brooks Mrs Joyce Campbell Mr Duncan Campbell Mr K Davall Mrs Isabel Davall Mr Robert Dennis Mrs Sylvia Dennis Mrs Karen Drummond Mr Alistair Drummond Mr J Edwards Mr Malcolm Elvidge Mr David Fernihough Mrs Anne Fox Mrs Heather Frame				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3368 PO3483 PO3344 PO3376 PO3450 PO3443 PO3320 PO3475 PO3612 PO3559 PO3409 PO3620 PO3672 PO3550 PO3401 PO3613 PO3527 PO3567 PO3566 PO3337 PO3596 PO3650 PO3492 PO3266 PO3400 PO3408 PO3294 PO3511 PO3345 PO3474 PO3467 PO3519 PO3360 PO3369 PO3305 PO3336 PO3329 PO3520 PO3551 PO3558 PO3385 PO3352 PO3271 PO3277 PO3282 PO3287 PO3417	Mr Tommy Frost Mr Frank Harding Mr Colin Hayes Mrs F R Hayward Mrs Pamela Johnson Mr Roger Johnson Mrs Mary Jones Mr & Mrs D Keates Mrs H Keeling Mr K Mannion Mrs Brenda Mills Mr Darren Potts Mrs Giovanna Potts Mr & Mrs J & C Smith Mr David Tavernor Mr David Thomas Maria Turley Mrs Jennifer Vasselin Miss Rachel Vasselin Mr S Waring Mr Kenneth Weston Mr Kenneth Whitefield Mr David Woodward Mrs J.F. Eaton Mr Saul Cutler Mrs Sara Tavernor Mr David Renshaw Millicent Stevenson Mr Christopher Jones Mr D Hancock Mrs J M Hancock Master James Kennaway Mr David Kennaway Mrs M E Nicholls Mr M Burton Ms Allison Keates Mr Alan Keates Mr Henry James Gibson Mr John W Bossons Mrs R H Bossons Mr A Gough Mrs J Hewitt Mr and Mrs A Brown Mr S Hassell Mrs C Moseley Mrs B Heesman Mr A Massey				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3637 PO3852 PO3663 PO3679 PO3680 PO3687 PO3700 PO3701 PO3708 PO3709 PO3717 PO3721 PO3722 PO3730 PO3731 PO3738 PO3739 PO3746 PO3747 PO3754 PO3755 PO3762 PO3763 PO3770 PO3771 PO3778 PO3779 PO3786 PO3787 PO3794 PO3795 PO3802 PO3803 PO3811 PO3812 PO3819 PO3820 PO3827	Mr David Renshaw Mr Philip Silk Mr and Mrs V M Elks Mr G Hodgkinson Mrs K Smith Mr I Crawford Mr JA Hayes Mr M Shirley Mr and Mrs M Nadova Mr P Cope Mrs J Cope Mr W Elks Mr D Richards Mr M Nad Ms T Janete Miss T Boulton Mrs J Saggars Mr C Loving Mr T Loving Mrs J Richardson Mrs C Hopkinson Mr and Mrs S Abbey Mrs P Richards Mr B Johnson Miss K Beardmore Mrs J Richards Mr R Broad Miss E Clough Mr P Clough Mr G Barks Mr A Wilson Mr P Titterton Miss K Wilson Miss R Oulsnam Miss R Allen Miss J Seddon Mr A Fox Miss T Millward				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required to contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3828 PO3835 PO3836 PO3843 PO3844 PO3851 PO3649 PO4776 PO4790 PO4802 PO4817 PO4820 PO4795 PO4782 PO4807 PO7470 PO7465 PO7459	Mr A Millward Mr R Turley Mrs D Harrison Mr A Wright Mr D Tomkinson Mrs J Tomkinson Mr K PicKin Mr Alan Copcutt Mr Richard Gallagher Jean Horsley Mrs Gillian Smith Ms Mary Walchester Mr Keeling Mr and Mrs R & J Lovatt Mrs R Johnson Mr Jack Dempsey MsLinda Powell Mr C Machin				Object	Logic suggests that the school would be better placed in a more central location rather than in the area with poor access and situated on an outer peninsular of the town, away from the majority of existing homes. The site previously earmarked for a school in 1998 Local plan is still undeveloped (field CH024 and CH009 combined area size 2.47ha) of Churchill Road. This area has been allocated for housing – why has it not been earmarked again for the school? Such a location makes sense on many counts, especially if walking, cycling is to be encouraged. In planning application SMD/2014/0227 Staffs County Council stated that a new primary school for Cheadle would cost in the region of 4 million. Based on their calculation in order to fund the new primary school it would require a developer contributions from over 100 dwellings, in order to pay for the new school potentially meaning that every new development in Cheadle up to 2031 will be required t contribute to the new school. Therefore, if the school does not require attaching any particular development in order to fund it, its location is of paramount importance. Staffs County Council are promoting 10 min walk to school zones. Indicating that it is a reasonable for Children to walk 10 minutes to school, any longer than that would most likely to take a car journey. Its seems logical that a site more centrally located would be more preferable to a site on the outskirts of town, if the Council would like to ensure that walking to school is maximised. The school site is not restricted to the North of the town. In a letter dated 15/09/2015 from Staffs County Council on Staffs Moorlands Council, James Chadwick Planning Policy Officer clearly states that it would be logical to place the School in the East or the North of the town. If the new primary school is to also to serve the East of the town then surely a site more accessible to the East would have been more preferable	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.
PO7077	MRS PENNY PLANT				Object	I object to the location of the proposed school site.	Objection noted
PO2553	Mr Andrew Weston				Object	The consultation should generate opinion from residents with local knowledge. Site CH132 constantly generates high levels of objections, where more sustainable areas are left out of the plan. Please listen to residents and remove the proposed school site is a very poor location with limited access and situated on the edge of the town meaning more school journeys by car. The site on CH024 is much better or other sites, such as the east could be considered.	• See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school. • See response to PO170 regarding traffic and access.
PO2902	Mr Raymond James				Object	Years ago Staffordshire County Council allocate the site for a school. Now owned by JCB as the site for a new school, this first noted, after Churchill Road was built 1% is an ideal site, being by the Churchill recreation ground and being central to Cheadle, this site is not subject to flooding being above the flood level of the Brooks.	• See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.
PO7073	Mr Alex Plant				Object	I object to the location of the proposed school site.	Objection noted.
PO7087	M Ellicock				Object	There are more suitable locations for a school site. The reality is that few pupils actually walk to school these days, they are dropped off by parents using their cars whilst commuting to work. Some are just driven to the school and then the parents drive back home afterwards. The congestion around the existing schools in Cheadle is considerable and a different site should be chosen that would minimize the impact upon residents, the current nominated site would cause maximum adverse impact upon residents and road structure.	• See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school. • See response to PO170 regarding traffic and access.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO8983	Mrs L J Hurst				Object	I objected to this area for development previously, for housing but mainly now, I object to the proposal to site a school - a primary school - there. Based on its location it's too far out of town and out on a limb and what a distance from the secondary schools! AND if it is built there it's going to be a couple of fields away from The Woodhouse 'home' which could pose a safety risk (amended). Can consideration be given to a new location please? How about the green belt land adjacent to MJS transport on Froghall Road? Exceptional circumstances and plenty of room for expansion.	- See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic. - The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment.
PO9640	Mr B Moreton				Object	Summary of representation (see attached) A new school would be better located in the north of the town which would reduce pressure on the SW and centre. Building in the north and east would be closer to the town centre and easier to access services and facilities. A number of option sites were closer to the town centre - walking and cycling would be real options.	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.
PO2811	Mrs Vera James				Object	Too close to the Kingsley school I ask the question, why build a school on the outskirts of Cheadle, is forward thinking to close the school at Kingsley? My husband knows a lot of history about all the sites in the north east area, was mined for over 700 years for the wood mining company, the field by JCB factory was in Staffs Moorland draft plan for 1998. Orchard Farm, off Churchill Road recreation ground. JCB tested this ground last year, bed rock 4-0" below the surface not affected by flooding, above the level of both brooks – highways already in place why if it was suitable in 1998 its not suitable now? Come on officers. It was an ideal site then why not now?	- See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school. - There are former mineral workings on the site. The Coal Authority have confirmed that this would not prevent development from taking place. Investigative work will take place in these areas prior to the commencement of any development.
PO3072	Mr W Wordsworth				Object	The is no need for more housing in Cheadle the roads won't take the extra traffic we could do with another school somewhere.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO3077	Ms J Croft				Object	I strongly object to any further building of properties in or around Cheadle. I also strongly object to the proposal of a school being built off Churchill road, the area is busy enough with traffic the area would be like Charles Street. Cheadle is classed as a market town and the area is under strain with traffic now without further houses being built that would possibly be owned by 2 car families. I strongly object to any house or school being built on green fields	The preferred location for a new school is not off Churchill Road.
PO102	Mrs Lesley Hackney				General comment	At the moment, the schools are not over subscribed but if housing plans go ahead then more school places will be needed however why would you build a school in this area when it is not the most populated or not adjacent to the most populated areas. You would be expecting people to walk long distances to attend a school on this site which would not be practical.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO3195	Mrs P Routledge				Object	School badly needed off Churchill road are road improvement needed 1 st.	See response to PO2733 regarding the proposed new school.
PO3276	Mr S Hassell				Object	Against the school to be built on Churchill road	The preferred location for a new school is not off Churchill Road.
PO3281	Mrs C Moseley				Object	Against the school to be built on Churchill road	The preferred location for a new school is not off Churchill Road.

Question 29 – Do you have any comments on the potential location for a new school in Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO807	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Bearing in mind the likelihood for the schools to be at their peak intake requirement and a number of schools from the surrounding villages have had to close through lack of use (eg Whiston Village School that closed January 2007), is there really a need for this extra school?	The need for an additional school has been confirmed by Staffordshire County Council.
PO620	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				General comment	if the school is in the north and the majority of new housing in the south it will increase the amount of cars travelling directly through the town each morning and afternoon. This doesn't make sense, it would be more practical to put a greater proportion of the housing in the north which is closer to the town centre than in the south.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO623	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				General comment	The area for the school will only be suitable if the new housing is built next to it. It does not make sense to build the school in the north and the housing in the south. Cheadle will be grid locked every morning and afternoon.	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO2550	Mrs V Weston				General comment	My opinion is that the school should be in a more centralised location and closer to the high schools to allow better links between the schools	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.
PO394	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				General comment	Why in the north, furthest away from the most residential area of Chedle in the south west and east??	See response to PO170 regarding the location of the new school and traffic.

Question 30 – Do you have any comments on the Cheadle town centre boundary?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent / Company Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO808	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.

Question 31 – Do you have any comments on the Cheadle primary and secondary frontages?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO809	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO1367	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			General comment	Map 4.8 - Cheadle Town Centre - Historic England has no objections in principle to the proposed primary and secondary frontages at this stage although it is difficult for these to be meaningful without any policy context at present. It is expected that such policy context would be addressed in the full Local Plan as it progresses and we may wish to comment further at that stage.	Comments noted. Policies relating to the primary and secondary frontages will be published in the next draft version of the Local Plan and comments will be invited.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO103	Mrs Lesley Hackney				General comment	I don't believe that the proposed number of new homes is needed. The evidence does not stack up. The road structure cannot support extra traffic and the proposed link road is not a link road in its present proposed location. It will merely divert traffic from new housing to the main road. This will not alleviate traffic hotspots as traffic will still need to go into town for schools, shops etc and also to pass through.	- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. Housing targets need to be based on robust and proportional evidence. - The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) identifies the likely impacts of the housing and employment Preferred Options sites on the surrounding highway network. By 2031 the study predicts queuing and delays in certain locations, in part due to 17 years of potential traffic growth which is compounded by the additional trips generated by new housing and employment. There is limited scope to change junction characteristics to improve network capacity within the Town Centre due to its historically confined road structure. The study recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. Mitigation measures include junction and lane improvements, new sites having good access to public transport provision, measures to encourage walking and cycling to reduce short trips, improved HGV signage and new parking bays along High Street. - The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential SW link road. Currently there is no link between the A522 Tean Road and Brookhouse Way / A521 due to it being severed by a disused railway line. The railway line is in third party ownership and a bridge will be required to connect a link road through. The proposed link road would allow a percentage of predicted trips from the SW area to traverse Brookhouse Way / A521 opposed to solely the A522, however the level of trips which would use the A521 from this area would have a minimal effect in improving congestion within Cheadle Town Centre. The study considers that the proposed Link Road would not be a solution on its own.
PO810	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO1307	Ms Melanie Lindsley	Planning Liaison Manager The Coal Authority			General comment	(Summary - please see attached file for full version) As you will be aware, the Staffordshire Moorlands area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting to approximately 22.07 of the Council area. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. The area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found	- Sites affected by mining legacy to have a policy criterion to clarify that developers should recognise mining legacy problems and demonstrate how they can be positively addressed by new development. - Most recent GIS information from the Coal Authority has been downloaded and informs the site assessments.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4255						in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. Within the Plan area there are approximately 1,225 recorded mine entries and around 205 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. A range of other mining legacy features are present, in total The Coal Authority High Risk Development Area covers approximately 6.98% of the Council area. Mining legacy is concentrated in and around the Towns of Biddulph and Cheadle and many of the villages south-west of the A523. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. No development should take place over mine entries even when treated. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. In our previous response on the 14 September 2015 we stated: "In assessing potential site allocations, it would therefore be prudent to include a criterion which assesses coal mining data. In accordance with NPPF guidance (paras. 109, 120, 121 and 166), this would be a due diligence check to ensure that potential development sites do not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development. This assessment should be undertaken by the LPA using the GIS data provided by the Coal Authority. The Coal Authority notes that the Development Risk product and Surface Coal Resource product were downloaded by the LPA on the 8 June 2015. The LPA should use the most up to date information available to inform its assessments." I note and welcome the fact that the site assessment documents covering the site options does identify ground instability arising from mining legacy and as such The Coal Authority supports the broad approach taken to site selection. We have no views on the actual sites chosen as this is a matter for local determination following consideration of all relevant factors.	
	PO1374	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England		General comment	Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This means that the plan, as a whole (including the sites it is putting forward as allocations) has to set out a framework which is likely to conserve the historic environment of the Plan area. The Plan puts forward a number of sites which, if developed, appear likely to affect the significance of one or more designated heritage assets in their vicinity. The Allocation of a site for development within the Local Plan is, in effect, establishing that the principle of development in that particular location is acceptable. However, in the case of this Local Plan, at present, there is no clear meaningful evaluation of what impact the development of these areas might have upon those heritage assets. The evidence base relies on the Historic Environment Character Assessment of 2010 and the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (LSCA) of 2008 amongst others. It is also noted that the SHLAA methodology includes reference to constraints and opportunities in relation to the LSCA but does not mention the Historic Environment Character Assessment. In addition, it is noted that the Halcrow Toolkit of 2011 used	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage impacts of the development allocations and mitigation measures.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						for the Core Strategy information has been used in respect of the current SHLAA. Table 2.1 of the site rating criteria includes reference to designated heritage assets, but there is no reference to non-designated heritage assets, setting or harm. As such, it is not clear how impact on the historic environment has been assessed and subsequently applied to the site options in relation to them being put forward as allocation sites, other than where mentioned in the associated SA. Even in the SA it is not clear how the sites have been assessed in respect of the historic environment. It is also of concern that Para 1.16 of the draft plan sets out that further evidence base studies will be completed to inform the Local Plan including Landscape and Heritage Impact Study. In the Options Sites Assessments tables, part of the evidence base, it is also noted that Heritage Impact Assessments will be undertaken during the plan production if sites, where negative effect on the historic environment and heritage assets has been identified, are taken forward. These assessments should be undertaken and considered at this stage to ensure that the preferred allocation sites are deliverable in respect of the historic environment but, at present, Part 7 of the SA does not deal with this. In the absence of any assessment of the degree of harm which the proposed Allocations might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the authority cannot demonstrate that the sites it is putting forward for development is compatible with the Plan's own policies for the protection of the historic environment. Moreover, in terms of national policy guidance, the Plan also fails to demonstrate that:- (a) The sites that it is putting forward for development will deliver a "positive strategy for the historic environment" as is required by NPPF Paragraph 126. (b) The sites that are allocated will be likely to "contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment". Therefore, it has not shown that it is likely to deliver sustainable development in terms of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 7]. (c) The sites which it has allocated are likely to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance". Therefore it has not shown that it will be likely to deliver the Government's objectives for the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 17]. (d) It has complied with the statutory duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas. Moreover, from the information available there is no evidence that, in preparing the Plan, the local planning authority has had "special regard to the desirability of preserving" any of its Listed Buildings. Whilst it is accepted that S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 does not apply, specifically, to Plan making, the absence of any evaluation potentially brings into question the deliverability of some sites and, for some, the amount of development they can accommodate. When the requirements of the Act are eventually undertaken, it may be found that the quantum of development on some of the sites is, either, unachievable or, at worst, that the need to safeguard the setting of the building actually renders them largely undevelopable. Please note that these comments are based on known heritage assets at a national level and do not include local information available through heritage environment records which should be considered by the local authority.	

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO823	Mr Alan Donaldson				General comment	The roads cannot cope now with the level of traffic that travels through Cheadle. The roundabout at the junction of the Ashbourne Road is a hazard, the design of the roundabout does not allow for a car and a HGV to meet, does not allow for a vehicle to turn left from the Ashbourne Road if there is another vehicle waiting to enter the roundabout from the Tean Road and the proposal of potentially over a 1000 new properties into the Town Boundary would bring in the region of 2000/2500 additional vehicles on these inadequate roads/junctions.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic and junctions.
PO2580	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	With regard to baseline data and additional new sites : The Council may need to check that up to date information on local wildlife sites (Sites of Biological Interest and Biodiversity Alert Sites in Staffordshire) has been referenced when identifying preferred sites. Our previous advice letter dated 14.9.15 gave detailed advice on themes and issues including these non-statutory sites. Natural England no longer has access to this dataset and the as the preferred sites consultation includes a number of additional sites (not considered as part of last year's consultation) the Council will need to access up to date information to check on any impacts on these sites. Please contact the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (01889 880 100 or email info@staffswt.org.uk) for further information if you do not hold the relevant dataset in house.	Comments noted.
PO2710	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The sites in Cheadle, although previously flagged up as requiring further work, should be able to design out flood risk given the small proportion of Flood Zones on the edge of them, and the fact that they are already modelled in detail, so the extents shouldn't increase.	Comments noted.
PO2800	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	CH135b: This site is located partially within Source Protection Zone 2. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place on this site (e.g. in relation to the storage of hazardous substances and drainage arrangements).	Comments noted. This site is not identified as a preferred option site.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2833	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The appropriate level and detail of ecological appraisal should be provided for any developments going forward on the proposed site allocations. These should be completed to CIEEM guidelines namely to identify and evaluate the ecological features of interest and potential impacts upon them. The mitigation hierarchy should be employed from the outset of any design and development planning to avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset impacts, both direct and indirect. Many proposed allocations are adjacent to priority habitats and statutory and non-statutory designated sites, including watercourses. In line with the mitigation hierarchy and relevant NPPF sections, i.e. 109, every effort should be made to re-naturalize watercourses, including de-culverting where technically feasible. The main impact on any sites from a developable point of view, are easements from watercourses to help promote Green and Blue corridors and networks where migration and movement along the watercourse banks can occur. This is likely to be between 5 metres, up to 10 metres on some main river stretches. Impacts on water quality need to be assessed, particularly the cumulative impact to ensure the relevant WFD waterbodies do not deteriorate in status and listed measures in the RBMP are taken into account. Collective contributions from specific areas could be used to support innovative land management schemes upstream in the catchment delivering natural flood management to reduce flood risk in the new developments and wider communities downstream. We would recommend and welcome the opportunity to comment on pre-applications to ensure the best opportunities and outcomes are realised.	Comments noted. Policies for sites affected by watercourses should require that early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority are undertaken.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2859	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Whilst we have not assessed each site in detail it is clear that many of them will be crossed by public rights of way which will need to be considered in full as part of any proposed development. We are also in the process of preparing the 4th Review of the Definitive Map and Statement for Staffordshire Moorlands area and the District Council will be provided with copies of the maps and Statement to indicate the alignment of all recorded routes. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council currently hold copies of the existing Definitive Map and Statement which should form part of any discussions with developers regarding the proposed sites. As the Plan progresses we suggest policy provision to ensure that all public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development. If any Public Path Orders are required to enable the development to take place these should be processed alongside the planning application by the District Council. Many of the sites chosen are close to existing urban areas and it is likely that there are non-definitive routes across the sites which should be considered by any applicants. In many cases these routes could have become rights of way by virtue of established usage over many years and should be treated as public. There will also be sites where such usage or historic evidence has already resulted in applications being made to the County Council under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. As the Plan evolves it would be useful to provide guidance to developers/applicants around enhancing the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include: - the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists across Staffordshire where there is currently a shortfall in available access routes. - the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking - the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture The County Council is able to provide further advice and guidance as and when required.	Comments noted. Public footpaths can be maintained or redirected. Policy provision to ensure that all public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development has been added, though it is recognised that they may have to be re-directed.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2881	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to more general matters regarding the Local Plan's approach and considering the incorporation of policies for the next iteration the following should be considered. A Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) has previously been prepared for the Staffordshire Moorlands and its focus and extent was informed through discussion with the District Council. The statement regarding the need for further evidence including a 'Heritage Impact Study' (s1.16) of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan booklet is to be supported and should also be welcomed by Historic England. This Heritage Impact Study should review the previous work of the HEA (and update where required), extend the boundaries of the previous study where necessary and enhance the assessment where appropriate. It should cover all aspects of the historic environment and be undertaken by a suitably experienced historic environment specialist following a detailed brief agreed in advance with Historic England, the SMDC Conservation Team and the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team. We have not assessed each site in detail as it is considered that the Heritage Impact Study (identified in s1.16) will undertake this work with reference to all relevant documentary information and databases (Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Record, National Heritage List for England etc). The Heritage Impact Study should also make use of all available recent studies to inform its assessment including, where appropriate, the relevant Extensive Urban Survey (available on www.staffordshire.gov.uk/ search under EUS) and the historic farmsteads guidance available on the same web pages. Bearing in mind the scale of many of these developments, where appropriate applicants should be encouraged to undertake, as a minimum, a Heritage Statement in support of any application in order to '...describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' (NPPF, s.128). Where more complex remains or larger developments are being considered, then a full Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment should be prepared. In all cases these documents should be prepared at an early stage by appropriately experienced historic environment specialists and they will inform discussions with the Local Planning Authority and their historic environment advisors regarding the need for and scale of any historic environment interventions including opportunities (where appropriate) to enhance heritage assets within a scheme. The Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team would be happy to be consulted by the historic environment specialist appointed to undertake the Heritage Impact Study. We would also be content to advise on the production of Heritage Statements/Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments to inform development proposals and can advise the LPA on, in particular, the archaeological and historic landscape character aspects of specific developments at the planning application stage.	The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage impacts of the development allocations.
PO2925	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	See attached transport comments in relation to sites.	Comments noted.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2929	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to surface water flood risk you have provided to us recently a GIS mapping layer of the proposed allocations that we have run through our flood risk software. Attached are our initial comments on the sites and it is hoped that these should help identify any potential issues at each site and assist in framing policy for assessment and SuDS requirements. However, we have only been able to undertake a high level initial assessment at this stage and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you further and perhaps identify sites that require further detailed consideration.	Comments noted. Further discussions have been held with SCC regarding flooding issues.
PO2571	Mr Alan Eaton				General comment	The infrastructure of Cheadle will not allow any more houses to be built. The roads in on out are at a standstill in the morning and again to 4pm in the afternoon. The one way system should never have happened the high st is a car park not safe for school children to walk along. In 1939 and 1947 a by-pass was talked about in 2016 we still have the same road structure. Drains are blocked schools are full we struggle to get a Drs appointment but never mind as long as staffs county council get £1000 for every house built on green belt even when there's plenty if brown field sites available. That money will not be spent in Cheadle we cannot get the roads required properly.	- National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. - There is not enough brownfield land/ sites to meet the District's proposed housing requirement within the built up area of the town. Brownfield sites have been included in the potential supply of sites. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2567	Mr Michael Feather				General comment	I note that you intend to build a new school where will the children go when they are older for secondary education.	The Council is working with Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO8	Mrs Desiree Billington				Object	We used to live and work in the heart of the West Midlands (the Black Country). A large urban sprawl and often very congested. After taking early retirement, in 2012, we chose to live in Cheadle, it being a very pleasant semi rural market town. Cheadle has the correct amount of properties and population to make it a very nice and friendly place to live. It does have its problems, it can get very congested at school times and morning and evening rush hour. In particular in the town centre and Tean Road. Tape Street is also a big problem having 3 sets of pedestrian crossing lights which causes tailbacks at certain times. No one wants any more building in Cheadle. There is not enough infrastructure to cope with an extra influx of people. Roads certainly cannot cope with more traffic. On a personal note, we do not want any more houses near to our property as this will cause noise pollution, obstruct our current views, invade our privacy, cause havoc to wildlife and maybe even cause environmental problems such as flooding, ie: houses being built on farm land which currently has good rain water drainage. Cheadle council need to think seriously about the upset and problems they are like to cause if they go ahead with a ludicrous idea of excess building anywhere in the town.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - Amenity issues such as overlooking, screening and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. - Developers will be required to provide a Flood Risk Assessment.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO337	Mr J Webster				Object	When the final plans are drafted detailing which areas are to be built upon, which areas will be developed first, and then in what order will subsequent property building take place, covering the whole period up until 2031 ? I understand this will eventually be decided upon, but fear that if it's not out in the public domain in the early stages of decision making, then it might be too late to raise any points of conflict. This will create unnecessary bitterness and hostility, which could easily be avoided with consideration for those affected. If, for example, the area where I live (South West of Cheadle), along with the so-called link road (that would serve no useful purpose whatsoever IMO), was left until the latter stages of the 2020's, then I'm certain that would be far more acceptable to a somewhat majority elderly population in the vicinity, who by that time probably couldn't care less how many houses or roads are built !	A housing trajectory has been prepared as part of the Preferred Options Local Plan and will be the subject of consultation alongside the Local Plan at the end of July 2017.
PO169	Mrs E Baskeyfield				Object	It does not make sense to build a new primary school at the north of the town yet have the proposed housing in the south. This will cause increased traffic chaos at peak times. The public open spaces are mainly private land and should not have been marked as public. This gives the impression that there is an even spread of public open space where as this is not the case. If the new school is in the north, then the housing should also be in the north to prevent the through flow of traffic through the town. It would also give good access to JCB and to Stoke-on-Trent for those working in the city. The schools whose land has been highlighted on this proposal have been made aware and I have contacted the SMDC directly to lodge my concerns about this. People should not be expected to make informed decisions when the information provided is incorrect.	- The proposed new school is planned to serve the north of the town and could therefore reduce school traffic currently accessing schools in the SW of the town. New housing development is also proposed in the north of the town. There are existing schools located in the SW of Cheadle to meet the needs of residents located in the south of the town. - Agreed that not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. A public open space study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands. One of the areas this will advise on is where improvements are needed to these spaces and new development in the vicinity could contribute towards this.
PO1077	Mrs Valerie Marsden				Object	I agree with all these issues mentioned it all makes sense.	Comments noted.
PO624	Mr Julian Baskeyfield				Object	The proposed development is too large for the town to service. The roads are not suitable for the increased amount of traffic especially in the town centre itself. The main roads though the town have traffic jams every day which will only get worse. The housing will be too dense in the south with no facilities, and it will be so far from any services that everyone will have to drive into the town. The proposed housing in the south will affect the water table which could have serious repercussions for residents further down the valley in Tean who have already suffered flooding this year. The town does not have the diversity of services that Leek does e.g major chains so for anyone moving here they will still have to travel further afield to buy clothing or other items. Therefore the diversity of shops in the town needs to improve and develop before planning housing otherwise it won't actually increase the trade in the town. The areas marked CH085a-d are in an area of outstanding beauty and heritage, having the old Cheadle railway running adjacent to it. This is an area used by many walkers and children playing and this will be lost if the development goes ahead. I am not against development but the location, density and scale will be very detrimental to the south of the town.	- It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process. The sites are within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. The area adjacent to the Brook is high probability and can be incorporated into uses other than housing i.e. open space. The Environment Agency has confirmed that a Level 2 SFRA will not be required as the developer should be able to design out flood risk given the small proportion of Flood Zones adjacent to them, and the fact that they are already modelled in detail, so the extents shouldn't increase. Any application would be accompanied by an Flood Risk Assessment which would consider surface water run-off. Mitigation would be required to ensure that

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							neighbouring areas are not affected. • New housing is known to have a positive economic impact on the local area and is considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. • New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links.
PO1331	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Not all the proposed allocation sites have had ecological surveys carried out. We understand around 11 sites have been added to the proposed allocation sites that were not consulted upon in 2015, and these have not been assessed for their ecological value. The SMDC Local Plan Policy C3 Sustainable Communities - Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 and 8.7.17 references the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, which “ will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” No Green Infrastructure Strategy has as yet been produced. Therefore, we are concerned that this lack of evidence base will not enable good decisions to be made on allocation sites. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys carried out by Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd in 2015 do not comprehensively cover all natural features that the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance list as needing to be mapped as part of ecological networks: the location and extent of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites; Existing designated sites are recognised, but identification of all Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is not as yet comprehensive. In terms of potential allocation sites, there are several where information from the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, other ecological survey reports for planning applications, and habitat data from MAGIC indicate potentially high value habitats, which should be assessed against the Staffordshire Local Wildlife Sites criteria. the distribution of protected and priority habitats and species ; Priority habitats and species are taken to mean those listed as habitats or species of Principal Importance for Conservation in England according to the list under section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, plus those listed on the Staffordshire, and any more local, Biodiversity Action Plan. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys do provide data that would allow identification of some priority habitats, but do not highlight priority habitats where they are present or use the definitions to describe habitats found. Recommendations for further protected and priority species surveys are made, but full information on their presence has not been gathered. areas of irreplaceable natural habitat , such as ancient woodland or limestone pavement, the significance of which may be derived from habitat age, uniqueness, species diversity and/or the impossibilities of re-creation; This includes veteran trees and ancient hedgerows. Records for these features are not comprehensive. Some veteran tree records are available on http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap It does not appear that this database was searched in the desk studies informing the habitat surveys in 2014. The survey reports do not specifically mention irreplaceable habitats. habitats where specific land management practices are required for their conservation; Some mention is made of current land management in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, but important areas are not highlighted. main landscape features which, due to their linear or continuous nature, are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchanges of plants and animals, including any potential for new habitat corridors to link any isolated sites that hold nature conservation value, and therefore improve species dispersal; Good habitat links and recommended buffer areas are mentioned in the	Ecus Ltd have now completed ecological assessment of all sites includes in the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries (April 2016) consultation. A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Staffordshire Moorlands has been produced by the Council with assistance from partners such as the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and will be published alongside the next Preferred Options consultation.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, and the information within the surveys could be used to identify corridors and stepping stones, but specific identification of these features is not part of the report or clearly and consistently highlighted. Corridors and stepping stones need to be recognised and protected, and their other benefits to visual and access amenity in urban areas recognised. areas with potential for habitat enhancement or restoration, including those necessary to help biodiversity adapt to climate change or which could assist with the habitats shifts and species migrations arising from climate change; The ecology surveys would help identify such areas, and some Visual Open Space and Public Open Space areas are proposed in the allocations plans, but areas to be enhanced in terms of habitat value are not specifically identified. information on the biodiversity and geodiversity value of previously developed sites and the opportunities for incorporating this in developments; Previously developed sites are among those proposed for allocation and covered by ecological surveys, which give some recommendations. However geodiversity is not covered. If ecological networks and other GI features could be mapped for each settlement, this would give a good basis for allocating sites, both for hard development, and for green space and environmental enhancements. This would also provide a framework for any CIL monies, partnership projects etc. to target priorities in the area and improve the environmental quality of each town and village.	

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1510 PO1503 PO1519 PO1509	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor				Object	This whole process is about Central Government trying to lead an economic recovery by force feeding property development upon local councils nationwide. The highly respected Sir Bill Cash is reported in the Daily Telegraph in 2011 as having concerns about the policy and is reported as saying “The developers will have the whip hand” Government Ministers responsible for implementing the policy are also reported to oppose developments in their own constituencies. We are now witnessing the Government policy first hand in Cheadle. No one wants it. Whats wrong with being a small town, if we wanted to live in a big town we have options to move. People choose to live in Cheadle because of what it is, it’s a small town with greenfield areas next to existing housing that add to residents quality of life. It is difficult to separate politics from this flawed “consultation” process, it is very much a voting process. Various political parties received donations from property development companies including a reported £3.3 million to the Conservative Party in 2011. The process is designed to reward developers for their donations. The Staffordshire Moorlands and Cheadle particularly could be changed for the worse and once it’s done, it can’t be reversed. The only control that Cheadle has regarding developments is to implement the enforced process in conjunction with SMDC. It’s a far cry from the days when the councils, who know Cheadle, have a history of denying planning consent for various reasons associated with various sites. Not least to preserve the greenfield amenities that add so much to the towns character and residential areas. The current plan for Cheadle takes town planning backwards by proposing to destroy green spaces within the area that has been defined as the town boundary. The phrase Sustainable Development appears regularly in various documents but for whose benefit, Cheadle residents or property developers. Well it’s not for residents benefit. It really means lowest cost to the developer and largely disregards anyone else. The voting or consultation process has also been made unnecessarily complicated for many residents, there is a lot to comment on regarding Cheadle and having to submit multiple forms, one for each “question” is quite off putting for many. Some people choose not to utilize online facilities or are unfamiliar with using a PC, if they own one. This leaves the hand written option and if you want to comment on five “questions” and your partner too, that’s ten separate comment forms.	- Central Government sets the national planning policy and Local Planning Authorities must prepare Local Plans that are in conformity with it or they will be found unsound. - The adopted Statement of Community Involvement sets out the ways in which the Council will consult at the various stages of the Plan’s preparation. Online, email and paper comments are all accepted.
PO2547	Mr R Snow				Object	I do not believe that SMDC are interested in Cheadle they are fast pursuing policy/s the government have laid down. That is to build more houses.	See response to comment PO1510.
PO2549	Mr J Weston				Object	There are more sustainable sites in Cheadle this should be removed.	See updated Sustainability Appraisal.
PO2554	Mrs J Weston				Object	I am disappointed that despite many objections by neighbouring residents this site has again been chosen for allocation.	Comment noted. See previous responses to issues raised.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2697	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	There is no commentary around the issue of flood risk and how the sites have been chosen with the Sequential process in mind. However, we do note that the sites we previously identified as being the most severely impacted due to flood risk, have not been taken forward to this stage, which we welcome. We have however, identified some sites where further work is necessary and we wish to remind the Local Planning Authority that Sequential Test evidence should be provided and reiterate if these sites are to be taken forward, then a Level 2 SFRA should also be undertaken. At this Preferred Options stage, this work should already be done. However, there is one final chance for this to be undertaken, prior to the Publication Draft towards the end of this year. If it is not done by that stage, the Site Allocation Document risks being found unsound as it will be at odds with the guidance set out in the SFRA Level 1 and potentially, Flood Risk policies that will be set out in the next consultation.	Sites identified are not located in Cheadle.
PO3016	Councillor Helen Lingard	Cheadle Town Council			Object	Why do you keep coming back with this stupid idea? Are you trying to test our patience?	Comment noted.
PO2529	MR ROBERT OWEN-JONES				Object	This is a small historic market town has no infrastructure or employment to justify the proposed massive increase in housing. There is nowhere to be seen, a proposal to improve the road network for usability and safety, nor is there anywhere to improve the employment business locations on the plans. This indicates that most people will be travelling and commuting to and from town, adding to the already chronic traffic situations	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2891	Mr Alan Moss				Object	Despite several surveys there are no proposals to improve the infrastructure of Cheadle, particularly roads. No further housing development should take place until the road system around Cheadle is improved to reflect the industrialisation of the Cheadle area which has taken place over the last 15 years.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2873	Mrs Margaret Moss				Object	Despite recent surveys there are current proposals to improve the road network around Cheadle, which is not fit to take the large number of vehicles currently using the Cheadle roads. Much of which, is generated by the industrial development around the town.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2847	mr michael tunnicliffe				Object	If we are to have more houses, I feel that the most appropriate location would be land from Brook houses to Mobberley including a relief road which would have little impact on the Town Centre, impact may ease the problems there.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2532	Mr Mark Alcock				Object	Roads cannot cope with what we have now. More houses would not help at all. A new school is needed but where?	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2528	Mrs Lara Austin				Object	We have lived in Cheadle for 30 years and seen many new housing developments yet no extra provision of schools doctors or dentists. I don't object to more housing as long as they are suitable locations that are fit for purpose. We are in need of a new school but again locations are key. Access and parking have to be taken into consideration. The proposal as they stand seem to be the opposite of what is logical and it's as if we are throwing up housing to meet targets. We have beautiful country side and are lucky to have it so I would like to see it stay that way for as long as possible.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3007	Mr Desmond Barnes				Object	No sensible pedestrian access. Too far out especially for people living Tean Road Rakeway areas of town.	New housing schemes will need to consider new pedestrian links.
PO3002	Mrs Sylvia Barnes				Object	Already suffering from too much traffic especially from May-Oct when towers opens, pavements very narrow and access via Queen Street involves lane delays.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2806	A Brattley				Object	I don't believe there should be any more in any large numbers in Cheadle area there are housing estates on most of the roads in and out of Cheadle more than enough considering the employment situation in the town. So build a school the other side of town from other schools is only going to result in more traffic around Cheadle which as more than enough traffic already.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - The proposed new school is planned to serve the north of Cheadle and could therefore reduce school traffic currently accessing schools in the SW of the town. New housing development is also proposed in the north of the town. There are existing schools located in the SW of Cheadle to meet the needs of residents located in the south of the town. The location of the school site to the north of Cheadle is supported by Staffordshire County Council.
PO2540	Mr Eric Cartlidge				Object	Why again are proposing housing in this part of Cheadle when there has been no roads improvements to the centre of Cheadle. There has been allocated housing sits for 30 years but no one has built on them. This is green belt and a elevated position looking across Cheadle. The foot paths on Frogall road are dangerous to any child walking past donkey lane the idea of a school on the edge of Cheadle is stupid.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - The area to the north east of Cheadle is not designated as Green Belt. - See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO2525	Mrs Carole Edwards				Object	Cheadle does not have sufficient infrastructure for more houses, doctors, work schools, water, sewage and busy roads.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2563	Mrs Angela Feather				Object	Building new houses and primary school in the proposed position will mean an increase in traffic in Frogall road and Cheadle town which is already unable to cope with the current traffic. How is this going to be addressed? Where are the children going to be taught when they leave the proposed primary school? Has this been addressed!	- The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. - See response to PO2567 regarding secondary education.
PO2521	Mr Damien Flynn				Object	Proposed local road infrastructure is woefully inadequate proposed school site is on the edge of this area - it should be central to NE Cheadle.	See response to PO2563 regarding highway access.
PO2982	Mr Ronald Fryer				Object	Cheadle does not need all these extra houses, the infrastructure is not there. At peak times Cheadle becomes gridlocked. The core strategy is all about building houses on beautiful green fields for immigrants	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing.
PO2543	Mr Andrew Gibson				Object	Why would any sensible council suggest building a school as far away from the town centre as possible is ridiculous? This would create more traffic and chaos which Cheadle cannot cope with.	See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2784	Miss Angela Gregory				Object	Cheadle does not require more houses its needs doctors. I have struggle to get appointments with a doctor and now it's getting as bad to see the nurse. I have to wait 2 months for a dentist appointment. The roads need repairing. The street and main roads in Cheadle can barely cope with the traffic coming through. The high street needs new shops, more shops. Better things for kids, somewhere they can play safely. Improve what we have. No more houses. Cheadle used to be thriving Market Town. There's no market anymore, its wasted space now a car park at the best. Cheadle is just a through road to Towers traffic nothing here to draw people in.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2539	Mrs Alice Hide				Object	Cheadle at the moment is gridlocked with traffic. Where we live when we have torrential rain the brook fills very quickly and if more houses are built we are going to have a flooding situation. We do not have enough doctors in cheadle area to cope with any more 100s of houses.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues.
PO2766	Mrs H Keeling				Object	I think we should have a look at the doctors and dentists, as you can imagine you can not get an appointment when you need them. We should have a look at the new shops for them to build to bring people into cheadle.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2558	Mr Stefan Lilleker				Object	I feel the location of a new school is situated in the wrong area I strongly object to all the proposed housing, due to the lack of Dr's (a week just to get into see your Dr) Dentist (I haven't even got one because they are all full). Lack of jobs and shops takeaways & pubs that's Cheadle site CH132 is not suitable for any development.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO2987	Mr Ian Menzies Lingard				Object	How many more times are you coming back with this? We have done this twice already and still no more services before more large scale building.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2824	Mrs B Massey				Object	When my husband and I first moved here in 1965 we were told that a ring road was planned, and 51 years later we are still waiting. The amount of traffic in the town is now past saturation point and we need more infrastructure in place before any more housing to is planned in this area.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2559	R S Matner				Object	Cheadle does not require more houses it needs doctors. I have struggled to get appointments with a doctor and now its getting bad to see the nurse. I have to wait 2mths for a dentist appt. The roads need repairing. The high street and main roads can barely cope with the heavy traffic coming through. The high street needs new shops, more shops. Better thhings for kids, somewhere the can play safely improve what we have. No more houses. Cheadle used to be thriving markets town. There's no market any more, it's a wasted space now. A car park at best, cheadle is just a through road for towers traffic there is nothing to draw people in.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2534	Mr Gareth Owen-Jones				Object	This is a small historic market town has no infrastructure or employment to justify the proposed massive increase in housing. Cheadle is a compact market town with a central layout that hasn't changed much for centuries. Absolutely no consideration has been given to improving the infrastructure for massive increase in traffic anywhere around the town but especially for inappropriately placed school. Where are the link roads bypasses and cycle lanes etc	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2835	Mrs Christine Pickin				Object	Why do you want to build a new school in the middle of nowhere? Surely it should be in the town centre. Why destroy our countryside. Why do we have to have all the travellers' sites for the moorlands in Cheadle and also a proportion of proposed housing sites? We have no extra jobs to offer.	• See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school. • There are no allocations for a traveller site in Cheadle.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2526	Mr And Mrs T & J Prince				Object	We have no room for any more houses or schools.	Comments noted.
PO2557	Mrs K Rogers				Object	I object to any further planning in Cheadle. The schools the dentist Dr's are full and cannot take any more. If we kept the houses for the people from far away we would need to build any more.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing.
PO2533	Miss Lynne Sanders				Object	Cheadle is fast becoming over crowded there are not enough school places or Dr's appointments available. The roads are grid locked at school times and then we have the added traffic for Alton towers throughout their season. How can the powers that be just think they can build a stack of houses (plus at least one more vehicle for each other without having sufficient facilities? Cheadle is going from big to small market town into a over populated one which is a real shame.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2552	Mr Oliver Weston				Object	There are better locations for a school within the town, the best site needs to found for the long term benefit for the local residents.	• See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO2520	Mrs Ena Wetwood				Object	Cheadle is the poor relation in SMDC. Cheadle is a dying town, shops closing, market is a joke. The traffic is horrendous; this discourages visitors from visiting the town. There is no infrastructure to cope with additional proposals.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2530	Mr A Emery				Object	There is nowhere to be seen, a proposal to improve the road network for usability and safety, nor is there anywhere to improve the employment business locations on the plans. This indicates that most people will be travelling and commuting to and from town, adding to the already chronic traffic situations This town need to have its infrastructure dealt with first and its road system sorting out before we go into putting more houses up. But i agree we need to build more houses as Cheadle is growing but this needs to corner all sectors. Young families single people and the elderly. And you need to look at the water tables, traffic, and facilities this town needs.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • Employment site options are also proposed in Cheadle to provide opportunities for local businesses and jobs.
PO2523	Mrs Rosemarie Green				Object	Yes we agree Cheadle has very little greenfields left and no need for that much housing. We came to Cheadle to retire and agree no need for further employment land, young people travel to better job opportunities and will probably leave soon after reducing need for more houses & employment in Cheadle. This will endanger wildlife and young people due to more access needed to the site and risk of flooding Not suitable for a school location.	• See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing. • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO2524	Mr Clive Green				Object	Yes it is approaching on green belt land (which Cheadle has very little of again). No need for more houses in this area as little employment to sustain them in Cheadle. Yes I object as it is on green land and it will devalue our property which we bought to retire in, not to be on a housing estate, more traffic, more noise etc It won't be in easy reach of pupils, so causing more traffic chaos and disruption.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2545	Mr John Elks				Object	We need a new surgery with at least 3 doctor's. Cheadle hospital should stay open with a accident and emergency unit as many old people have no transport to get to A & E at stoke hospital.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO2546	Mrs Mavis Elks				Object	We would need 2 new doctors surgeries and Cheadle hospital to stay open for the beds and an A & E unit like Leek as I have no transport to get me to A & E in Stoke.	See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2537	Mr Philip Simcock				Object	My concerns are regarding the flooding due to the Cecilly Mill brook. Some households have had letters saying they will not cover them for flood damage. Also another concern is the extra traffic; the roads are not suitable to cope with the extra volume.	- See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2538	Ms Marie Kennaway				Object	The general infrastructure off Cheadle is nightmare, with all the traffic that passes through the central outskirts of town in the north will only increase this problem as will be too far to walk.	- The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of sites in this area. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2522	Mrs J Whitefield				Object	I object to any large housing estate in Cheadle to me the best way would be to put a few houses dotted around the town on brownfield sites. The infrastructure of the town has to be sorted out before a big project is agreed; also the doctors, dentists etc cannot cope with all the people of the town without adding to it. A school well away from the rest of the schools is to me silly; just think how many more cars would have to go through the town (which at times can't cope now).	- There is not enough brownfield land or sites to meet the District's proposed housing requirement within the built up area of the town. - See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO3295	Mrs J Birks				Object	Cheadle is a flood plain. I think before you build any houses the roads needs putting in place. The traffic at the moment in Cheadle is a great problem. You have not really thought of about this. I thought your bypass and free to public plans were very misleading and not informal. Where are these people going to work or go to school, no senior schools were being built. What about doctors, we cannot get to see a doctor now so how will all these extra people get in? Why can't you build on Brownfield site in areas around Stoke on Trent where there is more work? The people of Cheadle want our wildlife species protected. Why dig up our beautiful green land?	- See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues - See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the Districts housing requirement is met. - Ecological surveys have been undertaken for each preferred site.
PO3300	Mr M Birks				Object	The map of proposals also shows a "dead end road" going to Moberley Housing proposal. From discussions with representatives of SMDC at the open day it was suggested that this road was not a dead end but a through road connecting to the Tay Estate onto the Blythe Bridge Road connecting onto the Blythe Road. If this case it should be shown as a through road. Again, misleading people to think different about the proposal. Before you build any more houses the roads need improving. Do the road's first and then no problem building as many houses required. Not sure where these new residents are going to work whatever they will need to travel there. Is this going to be the right approach by reducing emissions from cars etc.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues and link road.
PO3031	Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson				Object	We need green belt left alone. Doctor's facilities need upgrading to accommodate more housing. We need less housing built because we don't have enough jobs in the area for the people who live here already. The primary school and senior schools need upgrading to accommodate the children now. The primary school the council is on about should be built before the houses and should be up and running and ready welcome new families and existing ones. The new roads are congested enough without further traffic.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues - See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities
PO3249	K W Alcock				Object	Yes where are the roads to make it easier to travel and why there isn't a crossing at level to Salts Fish Shop. Do you want unsound land for housing because I don't?	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3254	Mr Roger Davis				Object	It's ok building houses but we have a high street that's not fit for purpose we have more empty shops than used ones. We need doctor's, dentist's, road repairs, there holes in the roads you can hide in, we need a by-pass around Cheadle before houses are built. The rest of the moorland towns get all they need, Leek being the prime example, we need a council that fights for Cheadle not give way all the time, to the rest.	See response to PO624 regarding economic benefits of new housing.
PO3046	Mrs Eva Moulton				Object	To build more houses on beautiful green fields will take away the natural habit of our wonderful wild life, at the same time this could put Cheadle at high risk of flooding I strongly object to this planning application.	- See response to PO3295 regarding ecological issues. - See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues
PO3041	Mr Kenneth George Moulton				Object	Cecilly Brook, floods now after heavy rainfall to build houses in its vicinity would be catastrophic. The brook also sustains a lot of wildlife water voles kingfishers and small species of fish to name a few. I strongly object to spoiling this wonderful landscape that surrounds Cheadle.	- See response to PO3295 regarding ecological issues. - See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues
PO2941	D Pittman				Object	There are too many houses in Cheadle and roads are congested leave the countryside as is. Why spoil what we have. It is beautiful.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues
PO2946	D Pittman				Object	Roads are too narrow to take more traffic. I object to more houses.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues
PO2966	Mr & Mrs R W Ratcliffe				Object	I object to more houses as employment in the area is very low, the roads are far too busy and always have large queues Alton Towers doesn't help, JCB doesn't has HGVS and the roads are not wide enough Cheadle needs a by-pass before more houses are built. It is very unsafe walking on pavements or crossing the roads for children and older people.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities.
PO2863	Mrs Dorothy Tunnicliffe				Object	There are times when Leek Road area of Cheadle is grid locked especially when JCB factory finishes work we cannot access our house because of the build-up. Also if a school is to be built at this end of the town, that would impact on the traffic situation. Houses would be better be built on the Mobberley/Brookhouse area where traffic could access A50 without coming into town.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school.
PO3021	Mr D Waring				Object	I personally know and would not recommend building houses near the fields and brook area which floods and they are great walking areas for people and dogs owners. There are also too many schools anyway than building an extra 1, which is already good, 3 primary schools, 2 high schools plus 1 college. There is 1 thing we do need is the shops to reopen there is a lot which have closed down which is located at the High Street.	- See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues. - New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links. - Staffordshire County Council have advised that a new primary school is required. - See response to PO624 regarding economic benefits of new housing.
PO2977	Mrs Susan Wiseman				Object	The road network around Cheadle is poor and until that concern is addressed people will continue to object to major builds.	See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2796	Mrs Florence Worsley				Object	I think the fields should be left alone. They are good for health, walking the dog, wild life. You are trying to move the town into our country side. Build a new school will not solve the problem; the children will need places when they are 11 years? Too much traffic on the road, not enough Dr's, day centre care homes etc.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2567 regarding secondary education.
PO3259	Mr A.R. Eaton				Object	Dentist and doctors will not cope with a greater population building houses in S/W and a school in N/E would add to the severe congestion in the town. Development bordering river Tean, will increase amount of surface water draining onto the river. This will add to the flood risk further down in Upper Tean.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school. - See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2956	Mrs Patricia Griffiths				Object	It seems that Cheadle + rural areas are being discriminated against in favour of Leek and Biddulph. Green Land must be preserved to avoid urban spread. A school must be accessible, if more children walk to school there are less issues with parking, pollution, from cars and risk of cars to children. It seems a waste of time and money to keep proposing a site which is clearly unsuitable and has been deemed unsuitable.	Comments noted.
PO2961	Mr John Shipley				Object	Having moved from Hanley to Cheadle what a wonderful place Cheadle is, apart from the roads being grid locked, brook, voles and wildlife being affected by building work, lots of takeaways spoil the high street, Police White Elephant only open from 9am and 5pm on weekdays money should have been better spent in Cheadle, leaving it as a small market town.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3026	Mrs Angela Jones				Object	Cheadle needs more adequate shopping outlet e.g. clothing and another supermarket. Also need another GP's as Cheadle has grown, but the facilities do not reflect this. Leisure facilities needed as many cannot travel to Leek, Uttoxeter for the cinema/bowling.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO624 regarding economic benefits of new housing.
PO2992	Mr Michael Sposito				Object	Cheadle roads are currently congested enough without the additional 150 + vehicles. Infrastructure i.e. schools, Dr's surgeries struggle to cope with our current population – what chance with an extra 500 + persons	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2997	Elvira Sposito				Object	Having got the surgery's to cope with now. Waiting already too long for appointment is chaos in rush Hour time to drive through Cheadle as the roads are congested more housing would add to it.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO2951	Mr Ronald Griffiths				Object	How will the pupils be transported to the new school site and should they walk through a new housing estate? Why is it always Cheadle, rather than other sites/places this has to be largest allocation of housing?	• See response to PO2806 regarding the location of the new school. • The proportion of new housing is set out in the Core Strategy : Leek 30%, Biddulph 20%, Cheadle 22% and the rural areas 28%.
PO2841	Mrs Hazel Simcock				Object	Traffic noise and hold ups on the road flooding due to the brook running back of houses in Sandown Close, Mount has sewage coming from the houses built.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues
PO3036	Mrs Susan Clare				Object	To build more houses & a school in this area is placing more pressure onto the already over populated area, causing more traffic problems and chaos. Cheadle does not have enough facilities to cope with the population living here already the road systems are inadequate and appalling to use. Devaluation to other properties before adding you should consider amending the already poor services supplied to the people of Cheadle.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3102	Mr D Gould				Object	Until a workable road system that bypasses Cheadle is implemented I am against any further population increase. I am also in total agreement that the population increase should reflect employment. Let's keep Cheadle district green.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities.
PO3139	Mr And Mrs J Greenwood				Object	We strongly object as the houses, school, all around Churchill Road and Hammersley Hayes, Froghall Road, will not take the increase in traffic.	• The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of sites in this area.
PO3051	Mr A Shenton				Object	Yes good luck on your campaign can not help carer for family.	• Comment noted.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3243	Mr C Smith				Object	The object of this consultation with the public should be that SMDC receive the views of the public and then implement policies which take into account the views expressed by the public. The public and in particular the people of the Staffordshire Moorlands are the people who the council are elected to represent. This particular is the latest in a series of consultations which have all very similar objectives. In the previous consultations, the people have been very clear in expressing their opposition to this massive, local development which significantly, over a period of time, change the nature of this small market town and cause problems for the people who live here. The council have not responded to the previous oppositions to the developments. At meeting in Cheadle relating to the last 'consultation', people were clearly expressing the views because it is clear that the council will not take there views into consideration. In addition, there are many people who are unaware of the consultation and its time frame and also the formal nature submission is not user friendly to people who are expected to respond. It should therefore take into account that objections to these developments only represent a fraction of the actual views of the people of Cheadle. Earlier this year, there was a storm which created flash flooding in Tean. Virtually all of the rainwater that falls in Cheadle area funnels towards Tean. Houses built have been developed in areas of Tean which are in reach of potential and actual flooding and, I understand the councils are proposing more houses in such areas. The developments in Cheadle, wherever they are situated, will result in a significant loss of soil which, at present, absorbs such rainfall. Each house built will soak off the ground where the house sits and also drives, the house frontages will be covered in tarmac, house rears will be covered in flagstones and decking which is the way with modern living. Roads to the houses will be built, again removing absorbing green countryside. When such rains as earlier in the year fall, the flooding which result in Tean, will be significantly worse. Have the people of Tean been made aware through 'consultation' of these ensuing problems? I am aware that a traffic survey was completed earlier this year on behalf of the council. However living in Cheadle shows that are traffic problems which quickly occur and bring the traffic to a standstill. There is little leeway for any problem? Some short time ago, there was a need for traffic lights on the Terrace adjacent to Park Lane and Lid Lane (possibly cable lying). At 5 o'clock on a Friday, I was travelling back to Cheadle via Tean. The effect that the traffic lights was such that the traffic had built up along Bank Street and along Chapel Street to the roundabout on Tape Street. The traffic had then built up on Tean Road. I joined the end of the queue just past Lime Trees veterinary Clinic on Tean Road which 100 hundred yards outside the Cheadle Boundary. I had selected this route having previously the horrendous queue from Brook houses. Today travelling through the High Street which is a one way, a bus in front stopped at the bus stop adjacent to the Nat West Bank. Behind the bus was a lorry which could not pass because of the limited road width. The traffic immediately built up at least to the visible end of the High street, blocking access to cross street. With the current road layouts, there is no capacity for increased traffic which will come about with this proposed significant increase in population. The bulk of the increased population will not be even employed here, just commuting to the Potteries what a disgraceful waste of energy and pollution of the environment.	• Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3134	Mr N Watson				Object	I object to any houses been built on green field as we need to retain our countryside. The roads around Cheadle will not cope with more traffic. If any houses have to be built there are some brown sites that are derelict that can be demolished and houses can be built there.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2571 regarding brown field sites.
PO3144	Mrs J Davies				Object	I have lived in Cheadle all my life and it seems to me that Staffs CC won't give up until they have ruined Cheadle completely. They do not care about our wonderful countryside or the fact that there is hardly any employment. Please, please listen to the people.	See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities.
PO3233	Mrs M Snow				Object	Cheadle is really run down the high street is scruffy the rec has hardly anything for the children to play on. Road surfaces on in a terrible state peak time they are grid locked, and someone thinks it's a grid idea to build more houses. Can't get a appointment at the Dr's because they are over stretched. We need money spending on the town before we have more houses and a school.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO624 regarding economic benefits of new housing.
PO3149	Mrs J Titterton				Object	We don't have the infrastructure to support it – the doctors, the dentist and the schools are all full. It takes a month to see a named Dr at my surgery. There are plenty of empty houses in the area that could be used.	- See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) makes an allowance for empty properties / houses that are for sale.
PO3092	Mrs C Goodwin				Object	When it suits SMDC you refuse planning applications when previously approved. Your planning dept doesn't or can't tell the difference between peak park rules and Staffs Moorlands rules. Concentrate on the conversion of Brown Field sites and building that are protected and left to rot fall to bits, unless some kind of bypass is built Cheadle cannot cope with any additional amount of traffic. Painted roundabouts are useless, large trucks use air lanes. Let's be realistic people, no more houses without a better road system!!!	- The Peak District National Park has it's own Local Plan and determines it's own planning applications. The Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan covers the area of the district lying outside the Peak Park. - See response to PO2571 regarding brown field sites. - See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3087	Mrs B Barks				Object	Yes need better road system due to grid lock at certain times of the day in most areas. Need shops that will get people to come to Cheadle, better market? What's gone wrong there? From how It was in the past years, paying for car park for town trade was a killer. Now they park anywhere on the high street, lorry's with shop stock have to ride around till they can park and unload a lot abuse the blue badge I have seen this first hand. Money need to be spent on Cheadle to attract firms in and new employment we need more doctors and dentists if we have more houses. Yes we could do with schools but that still means where the best place would be?	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. - See response to PO2530 regarding employment opportunities.
PO3129	Mr A Ainsworth				Object	Traffic is already an issue. All surveys magically happen when towers are closed and the children are off school, therefore, not giving a true reading of the problem. Cheadle is known outside as a green place to live + unfortunately these areas are rapidly disappearing. Why not refurb old unused buildings instead of making new ones.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - An allowance is made for small sites (less than 10 residential units) to come forward as windfall such as suitable unused buildings.
PO3164	Mr D Ainsworth				Object	I already can't get out of my drive in a morning! Do we really need more houses? When others are empty?	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO3149 regarding empty properties.
PO3124	Mr G Clewlow				Object	I fully support all the above questions more work is needed on the road/traffic alterations. Furthermore doctors, surgeries are already at bursting point more services are requested e.g. at least one more local petrol station, easing congestion. We cannot continually fill any space to benefit developers – who do not have to live here.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. - See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3159	Mr D Dunn				Object	Cheadle can't cope with current levels of transport; therefore extra will only cause more congestion! You have not proved a need for further extra housing	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing.
PO3154	Mrs P Dunn				Object	Cheadle has poor transport links. I don't think we need more housing putting pressure on this, this town does not need anymore housing.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing.
PO3169	Mr D Ratcliffe				Object	For new housing we should consider rent a shop – let's get people shopping Cheadle – reduce rates for local businesses. The Dr's surgeries are full – let's build upon the community if we have sufficient resources – for younger generations.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3215	Mr D Ratcliffe				Object	The road system in Cheadle is already in adequate, way too much traffic. How can we justify more housing? Remove the stupid 2 way 1 way system and this would improve the traffic or better still make it a 1 way system!	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3238	Mr R Lees				Object	I don't think any new housing should be built until a decent road system or ring road is built to cure the already congested roads around the town.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3210	Mr R Ball				Object	If more houses are to be built as the traffic is horrendous will towers traffic and school time traffic particularly Leek Road and Tean Road?	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3082	Mr A Hewitt				Object	I strongly object to any house or school being built on green fields. Please stop this over development of our town. If development is required logic needs to be sustained. Why develop on green field site on the side of town that experiences traffic problems via town hall Bank sites closer to the centre of town should be considered, if any sites at all. Sites closer to the South/West should be of higher importance as infrastructure to get to the city or transport links such as A50 or Blythe bridge train station make much more sense. Cheadle's infrastructure/road system cannot cope with increased traffic travelling through – hence sense is to develop at the opposite ends of the town. Please use your heads before this town you are proposing is ruined for good. Developments next to/on green field site should be avoided at all costs, especially when you are looking to develop the wrong side of town. If a school is required a better location would be the bottom of Tean Road or on Draycott cross road opposite New Hayden Road, these are much better locations for parents and commenting, heading to the city. For housing sites behind Wedgewood estate would make far more sense, and a school could even be added here. This would allow high volumes of children to walk to school. Unlike your current plan parents would drive through/out of Cheadle – drop their kids at school before heading back through town (hitting a mega busy town hall bank + one way system) to get off to work. Please see sense	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO169 regarding location of proposed school.
PO3205	Mr J Hewitt				Object	This proposal is the wrong side of town! Cheadle cannot cope with the traffic which heads towards the A50/Blythe Bridge, this development should be on the other side of the town.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues.
PO3200	Miss K Pickford-Avery				Object	I don't understand why it is being proposed to build these houses and school on this side of the town. Any new builds should be on the other side of town so as not to exacerbate the problems that already exist with traffic of Cheadle!	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO169 regarding location of proposed school.
PO3190	Mrs A Rogers				Object	More houses is likely to bring more cars. This will add to congestion at rush hour – it is already difficult to drive at night and morning because of the heavy traffic. Schools and doctors surgeries are already full. Don't need more problems.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3185	Miss S Ford				Object	Strongly object to. Difficult to comprehend	Comments noted.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3067	Mr J Lawler				Object	More services required for residents i.e. Dr's utilities some more of the empty shops/premises in the town Sort out the road issues. You can build more houses – but what will people do for work, in need of Dr's, and gridlocking already poor road system. Especially in high season.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3180	Mrs P Wordsworth				Object	Cheadle does not really need more housing , not enough jobs to go round but if need be, only few, we don't need be, only a few we, don't need many. We could do with another school though somewhere.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3062	Mr C Foster				Object	The existing roads in Cheadle cannot cope with the current level of traffic. To build significantly more houses will make the road system impossible. Ness Grove was built as a small estate road; it is used as a rat run and was not designed to take the current level of traffic.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • The Highways Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent future development in this area.
PO3174	Mr P Hollywood				Object	I feel that Cheadle does not have the required infrastructure to support the proposed housing developments. The roads are to support the proposed housing developments. The roads are struggling to hand i.e. the volume of traffic now so I cannot see how the town can cope with these proposed changes.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3057	Mrs A Hollywood				Object	This town is too small for any more houses the roads are too narrow and cannot handle any more traffic they are already breaking up GP's surgery are at their limit – waiting times are ridiculous Leave this town alone – no more houses	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3107	Mr I Millward				Object	Until a workable road system that by passes Cheadle is implemented I am against any further population increase. I am also in total agreeance that the population increase should reflect employment. Let's keep Cheadle district green. Build more houses around stoke and Hanley not in a small town like Cheadle. Rebuild on old industrial land or where houses used to be, not on green belt land. You cannot get through Cheadle in a car now God help us when this happens.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO3295 regarding building in the Potteries..
PO3113	Miss P Millward				Object	Could you please use the bigger cities for more housing developments not the countryside? Green Belt land.	See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing.
PO3118	Mr B Clare				Object	Before you build anything else in Cheadle you need to get the roads system sorted out because it is bad enough now. Also the Dr's can't cope with the demand of the patients	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO3222	Mr P Heath				Object	I strongly object to these plans Green field site should never be built on. They are precious assets and not only important for us but our children and wildlife. Once built on these sites will never be recovered. There must be many more sites which are more suitable for Cheadle's future housing. The people who make these plans are not affected by the outcomes- they don't live there – they lose the benefits of the green fields give. Some of these people don't even live in Cheadle. The environment is talked a lot by government yet they are bent on destroying it and local councils jump on the bandwagon for money! Shame on you.	• See response to PO103 regarding need for new housing. • See response to PO1510 regarding national planning policy.
PO3270	Mr and Mrs A Brown				Object	Maybe the land surrounding the former public house miners rest on Froghall road should also be considered for housing.	An allowance is made for small sites (less than 10 residential units) to come forward as windfall.
PO3286	Mrs B Heesman				Object	It seems to me that another school is needed also we need another Dr's. I walk to school with my younger child it takes 25mins the older child is of high school and its 35mins walk. The traffic going through Cheadle is already far too dangerous and more houses add to more traffic. This needs looking into instead of being given excuses all	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the time.	
PO4777	Mr Alan Copcutt				Object	The level and scale of development proposed in CH001 and CH132 , Cheadle North and North East, would mean compromising road, health, and safety issues, and will not provide Cheadle with an integrated and sustainable development plan. These areas I consider to be the least sustainable and desirable locations for development in Cheadle. 1. The 'Preferred Options Site Allocations' as part of the Local Plan, does not include any plans for removing non-essential traffic away from Cheadle and also omit any plans to reduce traffic conflicts in and around Cheadle. 2. Current traffic levels in and around Cheadle town centre need to be surveyed at all main junctions and over a long time period (at least 1 year minimum) to incorporate the daily data spikes and also the weekly and seasonal data spikes. The 2015 traffic survey was carried out in Dec 2014 and Jan, March and April 2015 and so provides non typical data given it was not peak season at Alton Towers, as well as not being able to capture data from the 'Perfect Storm' conditions of JCB working weeks, Alton Towers fully open, School term time, all businesses open. This is especially a concern considering the extra-ordinary impact on Cheadle, a Non-Typical market town, due to the proximity of locations of these 2 organisations: Cheadle is the nearest town and access point to the UK's No1 Theme Park, Alton Towers. The Cheadle area is home to JCB, the WORLD's largest digger manufacturer, with the majority of the main factories being in Cheadle or within a 10 mile radius. The main employment sites are situated in the West/South of Cheadle town. Also, the requirement for SMDC to liaise with neighbouring Councils, pre-dominantly Stoke County Council. I can find no evidence where SMDC has made any approach to Stoke County Council in order to discuss housing allocations and the potential development of housing in an area providing job opportunities, which would negate Cheadle becoming a 'dormitory town'. Brown field sites. The SMDC have not included brown field sites in the Site Options for housing, Eg. Froghall, Thomas Bolton old works site. These are a main omission by the Council and should be included when considering options for the number of houses proposed for Cheadle. Anti-social behaviour has increased in the town more recently (amended).	• See updated Sustainability Appraisal. • The 2015 survey included data when Alton Towers was open. • See response to PO103 regarding traffic and junctions. • The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area. • Housing sites are also proposed in the South West of Cheadle, close to where the existing employment areas are. • See response to PO2571 regarding brownfield sites.
PO4789	Mr Richard Gallagher				Object	We have been promised schools before to fund this school you need developers cash, so I think the school will never be developed will get houses built underhanded and corruptly.	• See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO4794	Mr Keeling				Object	Too much traffic on the roads at peak times. Already Dr's cannot cope with more residents.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.
PO7562	Mrs M Campbell				Object	CH093 Since 2009 I have been sending comments and response forms. My previous comments and letters still apply. I see a link road has been put back on the map which will do little to help congestion in the town, probably cause more problems in Tean. If we are to have more housing, roads need to be provided first i.e. a ring road further out to channel traffic especially heavy goods vehicles away from the narrow roads within Cheadle. (At present we need many potholes repaired). Also we need more medical facilities before more people live here. I enclose copies of my previous letters and my husband's in case you have not kept them.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues and link road. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6935	Mr M Bullock		Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Object	Following from the comments above, we would encourage the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the town and Green Belt boundaries in Cheadle and support a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process where appropriate - such as to accommodate residential development on part of the land in our client's ownership at Park Lane. Our previous representations have included submission of the following: A report in response to the SHLAA setting out the proposed development of our client's site and associated justification (see Enclosure 1); A diagram (Enclosure 2) showing the site's proximity and accessibility to Cheadle High Street and other facilities nearby including the nearest bus stops and supermarkets (all within walking distance); A further diagram (Enclosure 3) showing the site's relationship to a large number of buildings in the vicinity, which highlights the site's proximity to existing built development and confirms that the northern half of the site is an infill plot amongst this existing development; An indicative site plan and elevation (Enclosure 4) - featuring an access designed by highway consultants (SCP Transport) - to demonstrate that safe and suitable vehicular access onto the site could be achieved and showing the development of five detached single storey dwellings (with accommodation in the roofspace) on the front (north) part of the site, reflecting the building line of the existing residential properties on both sides of our client's site and demonstrating that a suitable housing layout of an appropriate density and character for the area could be provided on site taking other relevant factors into account. In response to the previous round of consultation, the Council published an Options Site Assessment, which forms part of the supporting documents to the current consultation. We would like to make the following comments in response to the content of the assessment of site CH165: 1. The assessment of site CH165 is based on the development of circa 26 dwellings, therefore no account has been taken of our previous representations that promote the development of circa 5 dwellings on the northern part of the site only. We would urge the LPA to reconsider the site on this basis. 2. Similarly, reference is made to the Green Belt Review concluding that the site makes a significant contribution and should not be considered for release, however it is considered that the impact would not be significant when considering the development of circa 5 single storey dwellings on the northern part of the site only - which is at lower level than the more prominent higher ground to the south - and the infill nature of the site (with existing dwellings to both sides). The combination of the topography of the lower part of the site and provision of dormer bungalows that would blend into and complement the existing dwellings to both sides of the site would limit the impact of the site's development on the Green Belt. 3. We welcome and support the acknowledgment that the site's accessibility to services, facilities and areas of existing employment is likely to have a positive effect. 4. Reference is made to the site's development having a significant negative effect as a result of it comprising greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land. However, there is a good supply of grade 3 land in the vicinity and furthermore the site has severely limited potential for agricultural purposes as a result of its limited size and the proximity of existing dwellings to both sides (east and west). 5. With regard to access, reference is made to SCC Highways commenting that Park Lane is narrow and unmade and would need to be widened and improved to provide access to this site. However the road already provides access to a number of residential properties - including some further west than our client's land - and was deemed a suitable access to serve other uses nearby including the adjoining cemetery (which we understand has or will be doubled in size without such concerns being raised	See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary comment number PO6934.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Page 4279						about the use of Park Lane to provide access to it). Furthermore we would also draw your attention to the section of our original SHLAA representations (Enclosure 1), which provide information on the low number of vehicle movements that would be generated by the development of circa five dwellings on the northern part of the site. 6. Further to the two points above, it is considered that traffic associated with residential development of the site would be more acceptable on Park Lane and the local highway network in general than the frequent use of larger vehicles associated with any future use of the site for agricultural purposes. With all the merits of the site in mind we would urge the LPA to re-consider the potential allocation of the front/northern part of our client's land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development along with associated revisions to the town and Green Belt boundary on the edge of Cheadle to accommodate this. The site is being promoted by a willing landowner and it is considered that the proposed development of five detached dwellings on the subject site is technically deliverable. Given the location and characteristics of the site and the availability of local services/utilities/infrastructure residential development of this site is economically viable and therefore achievable. Whilst the site is located within the Green Belt, we consider that additional sites are required to meet the housing needs of Cheadle and the district as a whole, particularly given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and other infill or windfall sites within the existing settlement boundary are severely limited. The release of land from the Green Belt is now further justified through an increase in the housing requirement, and as demonstrated in this submission, and other submissions made by Knights to date regarding the land at Park Lane, the release of the northern part of this site from the Green Belt is considered to be justified, effective, and would be consistent with national policy. I trust that this letter is clear in expressing our views regarding potential revisions to the Local Plan to incorporate the allocation of land at Park Lane, Cheadle for housing development.	

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7466	Ms Linda Powell				Object	The level and scale of development proposed in CH001 and CH132 , Cheadle North and North East, would mean compromising road, health, and safety issues, and will not provide Cheadle with an integrated and sustainable development plan. These areas I consider to be the least sustainable and desirable locations for development in Cheadle. The 'Preferred Options Site Allocations' as part of the Local Plan, does not include any plans for removing non-essential traffic away from Cheadle and also omit any plans to reduce traffic conflicts in and around Cheadle. Current traffic levels in and around Cheadle town centre need to be surveyed at all main junctions and over a long time period (at least 1 year minimum) to incorporate the daily data spikes and also the weekly and seasonal data spikes. The 2015 traffic survey was carried out in Dec 2014 and Jan, March and April 2015 and so provides non typical data given it was not peak season at Alton Towers, as well as not being able to capture data from the 'Perfect Storm' conditions of JCB working weeks, Alton Towers fully open, School term time, all businesses open. This is especially a concern considering the extra-ordinary impact on Cheadle, a Non-Typical market town, due to the proximity of locations of these 2 organisations: Cheadle is the nearest town and access point to the UK's No1 Theme Park, Alton Towers. The Cheadle area is home to JCB, the WORLD's largest digger manufacturer, with the majority of the main factories being in Cheadle or within a 10 mile radius. 4.The main employment sites are situated in the West/South of Cheadle town. 5.Also, the requirement for SMDC to liaise with neighbouring Councils, pre-dominantly Stoke County Council. I can find no evidence where SMDC has made any approach to Stoke County Council in order to discuss housing allocations and the potential development of housing in an area providing job opportunities, which would negate Cheadle becoming a 'dormitory town'. 6. Brown field sites. The SMDC have not included brown field sites in the Site Options for housing, Eg. Froghall, Thomas Bolton old works site. These are a main omission by the Council and should be included when considering options for the number of houses proposed for Cheadle.	• See updated Sustainability Appraisal. • The 2015 transport survey included data when Alton Towers was open. See response to PO103 regarding traffic and the Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017). • The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area. • Housing sites are also proposed in the South West of Cheadle, close to where the existing employment areas are. • See response to PO2571 regarding brownfield sites.
PO7460	Mr C Machin				Object	The addition of the proposed dwellings will ultimately increase the population of the town by approximately 25%, leading to an increase in traffic on existing poor infrastructure and exerting additional pressures on already stretched public services. There is potential for the substantial loss of greenfield and agricultural land around the edge of the town, leading to environmental implications such as impacts on flora and fauna, increasing the risk of flooding and damaging the rural picturesque setting of the town.	• See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues. • See response to PO2571 regarding infrastructure. • See response to PO3295 regarding ecological issues. • See response to PO624 regarding flooding issues. • The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) has considered the preferred option sites and suggests site-specific landscape mitigation measures where necessary.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7054		Danbank Developments Ltd	Richard Barton	HOW Planning LLP	Object	HOW Planning LLP (“HOW Planning”) has been instructed by Danbank Developments to prepare and submit representations to the Staffordshire Moorlands: Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries consultation (“the Preferred Options Site and Boundaries”). Danbank Developments is the owner of a parcel of land located off Brookhouse Way, Cheadle, which benefits from extant outline planning permission for a mixed use development comprising a residential development of up to 43 dwellings and up to 1,350sqm of employment use (Permission Ref. SMD/2014/0655). The site location plan is identified at Appendix 1 to this letter. Illustrated at Map 4.7 of the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries are the locations of the preferred housing, employment, public open space, and other key infrastructure. One such identified element of infrastructure is the ‘Potential Link Road – Indicative Route Only’ which is identified within draft housing allocations CH085A, CH085B, CH085C, CH085D and CH128. Table 4.13B states that land will be safeguarded within these draft housing allocations to accommodate a potential link road. Danbank Developments acknowledge that the document published for consultation is with respect to sites and boundaries only, and that a separate consultation will be held later in 2016 regarding policies, however Danbank Developments consider that the following points should be considered by the Council and fully addressed within the Preferred Options Policies when published later this year. The Indicative Route of the Proposed Link Road Map 4.7 provides an indicative route for the proposed link road. Whilst Danbank Developments accept that at this stage of the Local plan it is onerous to provide a detailing routing of the link road, Danbank Developments do have concerns that the Preferred Sites and Boundaries omits to consider the location where the link road would be joining the existing road network at its northern connection. As drafted, the indicative route of the link road ends within draft allocation CH085a. Danbank Developments’ land holding is located to west of draft allocation CH085a and provides a connection to Brookhouse Way and onto The Green (A521). In the absence of detailed information regarding connections to the existing road network, Danbank Developments have concerns regarding the Council’s expectation of the Brookhouse Way site in accommodating land for any potential link road. Proposed Link Road Evidence Base No detailed evidence, with respect to highways or viability/feasibility, has been produced by the Council to support the proposed link road. In order to meet the tests of soundness set out at paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), a Local Plan must be justified and effective. To be justified, the plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative, based on proportionate evidence; and to be effective, the plan should be deliverable over its period. In the absence of detailed evidence to support the proposed link road, the tests of the NPPF are not met. As such, Danbank Developments reiterate that this evidence must inform the Preferred Options Policies when published later this year to ensure that the Local Plan promotes a sound strategy of this key infrastructure. Given the present uncertainties detailed within this letter, Danbank Developments would be grateful if a meeting could be arranged with the Council to discuss the relationship between the Brookhouse Way site and the proposed link road.	- The Cheadle Town Centre Phase 2 Study (2017) considers the potential SW link road. Currently there is no link between the A522 Tean Road and Brookhouse Way / A521 due to it being severed by a disused railway line. The railway line is in third party ownership and a bridge will be required to connect a link road through. The proposed link road would allow a percentage of predicted trips from the SW area to traverse Brookhouse Way / A521 opposed to solely the A522, however the level of trips which would use the A521 from this area would have a minimal effect in improving congestion within Cheadle Town Centre. The study considers that the proposed Link Road would not be a solution on its own. - It should be noted that as part of the Land Off Brookhouse Way Outline planning approval for a mixed development with associated open space, highways and landscaping, the extension to Brookhouse Way will provide a section of a spine road to traverse up to the edge of the disused railway line. Such a road would not initially link the A521 and A522 but could form part of a future link road to do so.
PO7088	M Ellicock				Object	Cheadle is a very pleasant town to live in at the moment, sadly it is in danger of being completely ruined by developers.	Comments noted.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO6852	unknown unknown		Mr G Willard		Object	The plan fails to provide suitable and clearly identified sites for small scale local housing which may be suitable for local house-builders or those who wish to build their own homes. There is a significant need for such land as the identified article (Appendix A) clearly sets out. The site herein identified could provide a site for up to and for no more than 10 self build housing units. Such provision would accord wholly with the NPPF. The same article identifies a recent survey which shows ‘ that Lack of available and viable land was the most commonly cited barrier to increasing output’ identified by small builders. Para 159 of the NPPF says the following in respect of planning for housing provision: Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should: • prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment: • should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which: – meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; – addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); 34 and – caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand; • prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period. * Note - my emphasis in bold. Albeit that the council may contest that this plan is not looking to identify smaller sites it does propose a revised town boundary which inherently will fix both the location of major housing sites and determine where small or infill housing sites may go in the future. There are few if any small sites identified within the plan. For this reason the proposed Green Belt and settlement boundary ought to be changed and a small custom build housing site in respect of land off Park Lane be included within the plan as set out in this submission. Appendix A - Article from web site of Federation of Master-builders. HOUSING AND PLANNING THE NEED FOR NEW HOUSE BUILDING New house building brings enormous economic and social benefits and it is widely accepted that there is a pressing need for the UK to build many more homes than it is currently doing. The number of households in England alone is growing at the rate of over 220,000 each year, yet only 124,520 new homes were built in England in 2014/15. The last time more than 200,000 homes were built in a single year in England was in 1988. THE DECLINE OF SMES IN THE HOUSE BUILDING INDUSTRY An analysis of NHBC statistics shows that in 1988, firms completing less than 500 units per annum delivered two-thirds of all new homes in the UK. However, the number of small and medium sized (SME) house building firms has declined significantly since then and in 2014 only 30% of new homes were delivered by firms of this size. This trend has accelerated over the course of the economic downturn, with the number of SME house builders in operation having halved since 2007. This represents a serious loss of capacity in the UK house building industry which must begin to be reversed if we are to start building the number of new homes we need. We need to enable growth in output among existing firms, an increase in new entrants to the industry and make better use the of the large numbers of skilled small contractors who would have the capacity. In order to do this, we need to address the major barriers and structural constraints which	• See response to Question 26 – Green Belt Boundary, comment number PO6843. • Local Plan Policy H1 refers to self-build.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						continue to operate on SME house builders. • Access to finance for small developers and new entrants • The availability of suitable and viable small sites • Disproportionate cost, complexity and delay in the planning system • Excessive demands for developer contributions placed on small sites FMB HOUSE BUILDERS SURVEY The FMB conducts a yearly survey of its house builder members. Download The FMB's 2015 House Builders Survey (PDF, 2.5MB). Some of the key findings of the 2015 Survey are: • 'Lack of available and viable land' was the most commonly cited barrier to increasing output (68% of respondents) followed by 'lack of finance to the company' (62%). • 27% cited lack of skilled workers as a major barrier to supply and this increased to 32% when asked to look ahead at the next three years. • Asked to rate current lending conditions to SMEs for residential property development from zero to five the average score was 1.59; this was p from 1.20 in 2014 and 0.95 in 2013. • 27% of respondents reported improved lending conditions, though two-thirds (67%) reported no change. • 52% of respondents stated that they were involved in sites which were stalled for financial reasons. • 56% of respondents stated that the Government's 'Starter Homes' scheme is a product which they believe could make business sense for them to build and sell. • 41% of respondents said that there were sites which they would otherwise be interested in but which they believed would be unviable due to likely Section 106, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or other obligations.	
06936	Ms Joanne Harrison				Object	I have attached a plan for Cheadle which shows in red 3 areas of land that we would like listed as industrial employment sites. Can these sites be included in the Local Plan? (Area 1 is adjacent to the junction of Draycott Cross Road & Delphouse Road - Green Belt) (Area 2 is north of Hillside Industrial Park - Green Belt) (Area 3 is part of previous site option CH094 - Green Belt)	- The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. - Areas 1 & 2 fall within parcel S15 of the Green Belt review which comprises pasture, woodland and isolated dwellings and there is some evidence of a role in helping to contain the various industrial intrusions (outside the Green Belt) associated with the westerly edge of Cheadle: - Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution - Area 3 falls within parcel S17 of the Green Belt review which comprises a complex parcel comprising woodland, pasture and extensive disused mineral workings, adjoining sprawling industrial land constituting the westerly edge of Cheadle: - Check unrestricted sprawl – contribution - Prevent towns merging – limited contribution - Safeguarding from encroachment – contribution - Setting of towns – limited contribution - Assist regeneration – limited contribution - Although the sites are well related to the edge of Cheadle and existing industrial areas, it is considered that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify amendment of the Green

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Belt boundary in this location. There are other employment sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.
PO8987	Mrs L J Hurst				Object	This objection is in respect of the proposed new road passing through the above sites (CH085a, CH085b, CH085c, CH085d and CH128) and running between Tean Road at Mobberley and The Green, Brookhouses. What will it achieve?	See response to PO103 regarding link road.
PO8989	Mrs L J Hurst				Object	My general comment is that I feel that I have not been listened to, having responded to the last consultation with support for and objections to proposals I feel it was all in vain and no-one is 'seeing sense' for Cheadle. I would have liked to have seen my facial reaction when I saw the latest preferred sites because I was shocked and thought "What's the Point?" But it's my town and I want to do my best for it.	Comments noted.
PO7522	Mr Philip Walton				Object	CH093 Summary of representation - please see full response (attached). Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: not enough capacity in local schools & additional school traffic created; doctors, dentists and shops are all over 1km which will create more traffic; Staffs CC ruled out a southern link road; Latest traffic survey is not available; access to the site would be difficult; flooding issues along River Tean and surface water flooding issues; access to the site is bounded by a railway line which is leased by Network Rail to Moorlands and City Railways Ltd on a 15 year lease from 2011. Reopening of the line is possible; consultation is being repeated when a previous attempt was thrown out; one consultation meeting was inadequate; open space cannot be replaced; lack of public open space; green spaces indicated are playing fields with no public access; scale of building is disproportionate to the size of Cheadle's infrastructure; sites to the north of Cheadle would bring this balance provided additional facilities such as schools, shops, dentists and doctors are provided; where are all the people going to come from to fill these new houses? lack of public open space and existing spaces need improving; no new spaces indicated on the plans; few employment plans, where are all the new people going to work? roads are inadequate for the current levels of traffic; medical facilities are already overstretched. An improvement in the infrastructure of the town would help the general acceptance of these proposals	A small part of CH093 has now been included within CH085d. Please see comments in relation to this site. The rest of CH093 is not included as a preferred housing site.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7487	Mrs Carol Hill				Object	CH165 What are you playing at ?, having attended the final 'drop in' event presented at the Guild Hall Cheadle, the over-riding mood of the public in attendance was one of 'all the decisions have already been made', Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and it's attending officers are putting on a passive 'show' before getting on with it. We have studied the on-line draft plan and are alarmed to see CH165 with the number 65 in brackets on the draft. Having studied and cross referenced other sites we are reasonably sure this refers to the number of proposed dwellings. CH165 is a tiny constrained, ill conceived potential site with lousy access, exactly opposite the soon to be extended Cheadle cemetery. We do hope that the figure printed on CH165 is an unfortunate printing error, we all make mistakes even Staffordshire Moorlands District Council ! If our original objection to the forwarding of this small piece of land as having potential for housing development is studied, you will note that we point out that the original site assessment form states in the Strengths/Opportunities column quote NOT ALL OF THE SITE WOULD HAVE TO BE INCLUDED un-quote, Also on the assessment form the FULL CAPACITY is stated at 26 dwellings. The site assessment form goes onto suggest that not all of the site would have to be used, this statement makes complete nonsense i.e propose 26 houses, settle for less, maybe even less than the minimum small town criterion Oh and you stick No 65 on it. Finally the ' draft' plan demonstrates that Cheadle will never be the same again, changed for the worse, decisions have been made from the top down, typically those making the decisions will not suffer the consequences. One final question, with the odd exception when did the elected Councillors stop acting on and considering the interests of those people that voted for them, some don't even have the decency an manners to reply to questions and e-mails ! As our original objection said, we did object and still do most strongly to CH165 even being considered for housing development.	Site CH165 was included as a potential site at the site options stage but was not included at the preferred options stage.
PO9083	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	Summary of representation (see attached) The site option detailed on the maps do not reflect the level of development proposed through to 2031. Of the remaining requirement of 1029 dwellings, nearly half are not as yet identified, including 445 described as a s small urban extensions. Further housing proposals have already been considered and approved e.g. Thorley Drive - 60 properties that are not considered as part of the housing allocation. The local community are not being presented with a clear picture of the full likely impact on the town and landscape.	- Table 4.11 in the Preferred Options document lists the anticipated housing provision for Cheadle up to 2031. Sites included as urban extensions are included in Table 4.13 B). - The Thorley Drive planning permission can be taken into account as a housing commitment once the final decision notice has been issued. Housing commitments form part of the supply of new housing and will be deducted from the required provision for Cheadle.
PO9074	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Strategy ignores reality and promotes a declining standard of living due to road issues. Cheadle has serious road network issues that are a barrier to further expansion of the town. Traffic surveys have found that roads are already running at capacity. All SMDC have done is suggest a SW bypass but the reality is that no road improvements are mandatory before more housing is developed. Understand that SMDC did look at a NW link road but the costs were prohibitive. Surely if no adequate road improvements can be made development must go where the infrastructure exists e.g. Stoke-on-Trent.	- See response to PO103 regarding traffic issues and the SW link road. - See response to PO3295 regarding meeting housing needs.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO10261	Mrs Jennifer C Moreton				Object	Site ref CH093 Settlement CHEADLE In this area there is a major flaw in the fact that you are taking away all of the available access to countryside. Cheadle was built in a basin apart from the North which has a continuation of green fields for miles to Kingsley Holt, Whiston etc. On the south west the only countryside left is one small field and Huntley Woods were are not accessible to public. Therefore this will be COMPLETE OVER KILL OF THE SOUTH WEST OF CHEADLE. You will diminish the availability to walk this countryside by all the residents who use it on a very regular basis. In your plan you are joining Cheadle with Teanford and this is not fair or acceptable to the South West residents. You also will need to break through the area of the old railway line . This area close to the Huntley woods has great potential as a place of pleasure something we are very short of in Cheadle and indeed should be preserved not decimated the whole of this area greatly adds to the quality of life to us in the South West. The road you have on your plan shows it goes nowhere! in 1998 The SMDC fought ardently with Danbank saying the road was not viable and the expense was far too great. This road would not help the traffic because most of the traffic travelling through goes to the Potteries.It was suggested at that enquiry the builders would never finish this road because the costs were too great. Staffs County Council then said there were no finances availableat that time and the case remains the same to-day.In the South West we already take the brunt for 2 High Schools, 1 Sixth Form and 1 Primary school,also most of Cheadle's Industry, Why are you persisting in creating more congestion in an area already experienceing problems ? a SOUTH WEST LINK ROAD WILL NOT WORK AS IT WAS IN 1998 IT IS A ROAD TO KNOWHERE. The adjacent houses to the areas I refer are approx 500 Houses, (Dandillions estate and Wedgewood estate). Your plans are to ajoin another 500 making a 1,000 mass of residential properties. This is not good planning. These houses should be divided into smaller groups and distributed more evenly around the town. Why is there no building suggested for the North i.e. Leek Road A522 areas. JCB is in Leek Road and we have to cope with the traffic and employees coming from the South of Cheadle. Whereas I am not suggesting 500 be built there I do consider that part of the area on the East Side of Leek Road would be viable. This would also help with the proposed School in the North East. The School Buses we have to contend with amount to approx 30/40 buses, taxi's mini buses per day morning and night as well as numerouse parental transport. This South West is a further walking distance to our town centre than Leek Road. Does the Government not suggest houses should be built as close as possible to the centre of a Town ?	• See response to PO7522 regarding site CH093. • See response to PO103 regarding SW link road.
PO9639	Mr B Moreton				Object	Summary of representation (see attached) Link road Sites depend on the delivery of a Southern Link Road for access. The 'disused' railway line to the west owned by Network Rail has a 15 year lease to Moorlands and City Railway and could reopen. The rail route should be protected. Access to the sites is therefore not available from the North and West. From the south access would be through Green Belt land from a dangerous bend on the Tean Road and add more traffic. Building of a southern link road was refused at the Core Strategy examination. The road is not listed in the Staffordshire County Council list of schemes and there is a policy of implementing initiatives to reduce traffic rather than to provide for growth. New link road would do nothing to relieve traffic problems in Cheadle.	See response to PO103 regarding SW link road.

Question 32 – Do you have any other comments to make regarding Cheadle?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO395	Mrs Joanne Chadwick					The developments plans seem very unbalanced as regards to Cheadle town. The south west seem to have drawn the short straw and I cannot see why. When you reassess the road situation please can you do it at a prime time when the schools are open, alton towers is open and JCB are working, not in the holidays as you have previously done. This may give you a clearer picture of why residents are concerned. I am not opposed to some development as I think it is good for the town but this plan has too many houses for a town like Cheadle, with not enough emphasis on the retail aspect. I still question why certain areas or Cheadle seem to have escaped without any development and if the housing allocation has to remain then this maybe should be reviewed and it shared more evenly throughout the town. This may support resident acceptance of the scheme!	• See response to PO103 regarding the tansport studdy and traffic. • See response to PO624 regarding the economic benefits of new housing. • The Council has considered a number of sites within and on the edge of Cheadle. The majority of the proposed area for housing is located within the existing town boundary. It is acknowledged that together the cumulative amount of housing in this area would be significant, however, there are infrastructure benefits arising from allocating a larger area for residential development, such as highway improvements, affordable housing and community facilities such as public open space.

This page is intentionally left blank

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1344	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Site AL012, the only proposed housing allocation, needs further survey prior to formal allocation; the species-rich hedges identified in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys (site FID 129) need assessment against the current Staffordshire Local Wildlife Site criteria for hedges, as they may well deserve designation. This may not impact on the allocation but the presence of a locally designated site would need to be considered before making a formal decision.	The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site had 3 trees and 1 building with bat potential and also species rich hedgerows and species poor grasslands connected to other habitats. A further ecological study is being undertaken the results of which will inform the site allocation and policies in the Local Plan
PO1249	Mr J Amphlett				Object	Utilities re inadequate for growth and population roads are already heavily congestion with the surrounding schools p/o on the trees in the field. Disurbing wildlife Spoiling the lovely countryside Poor drainage - constant flooding	- Outline planning permission pending for 13 dwellings SMD/2014/0824 - The Highways Authority have not raised any issues that would prevent the development of the site. They consider the site is acceptable subject to access design and provision of appropriate visibility splay. Visibility from Allotment Lane should be provided across frontage. - The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - Policies for sites affected by watercourses should require that early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority are

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							undertaken - The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations, the study found the site is of low landscape sensitivity - See response to PO1344 regarding wildlife
PO910	Mr Howard Leeson	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Object	Please see the response to Question 33. It is contended that there should be more emphasis on infill than on larger sites.	See response to question 33
PO1111	Mr & Mrs D Coultas				Object	We were opposed to this development at Capri, Gallows Green along with a considerable number of other residents and this was approved against the aspirations of the local community. The type of houses that have been approved fail to meet the needs of the village, which if anything, require starter homes for the young and bungalows for the old, thus freeing up the large number of family homes (that are currently inhabited by elderly people who do not wish to leave the village) that could be made available. A perfect example of NOT reflecting the needs and aspirations of the local community.	Outline planning permission pending for 13 dwellings SMD/2014/0824
PO1610	Mr Charles Harris				General comment	I endorse and support this proposal the village boundary shown on the site plan for Alton i.e. identified within the consultation draft of the proposed village boundary, in so far as it restates the existing boundary amended for the inclusion of the site AL012 (for	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						which planning permission for 18 dwellings has been granted). I wish to make it clear that I would not support the inclusion of any further sites (reserve sites) for Alton in the local plan. In addition to site AL012 there have been a number of recent building completions. I am aware of further new infill builds that are planned (some already having planning permission) within the existing village boundary which can be expected to add more than 10 dwellings to the existing housing stock. I am firmly of the view that Alton with a population of c1000 already has a more than adequate 5 year forward supply of housing and I can see no reason whatever for any further sites to be added outside of the revised village boundary. There are serious concerns about infrastructure and sustainability that naturally limits other than modest growth of this village. This plan as currently set is a sustainable plan that will ensure that the need for new housing in Alton for the next 30 years is satisfied through availability of appropriate sites encompassed by the proposed village boundary as described above.	
PO2916	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In Alton Site AL012 improvement/realignment to Allotment Lane should be included.	Outline planning permission pending for 13 dwellings SMD/2014/0824
PO4712	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			Support	This representation is made on behalf of the owners of site AL012. The site is in single ownership and the site owners are willing and able to release the site for housing. The site has no technical or other planning obstacles preventing housing from being	Comments noted.

Q37- Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						built within the plan period. Moreover the council have already resolved to grant planning permission (SMD/2014/0824) residential development on all of the allocated site. The site owner wishes to reserve their right to object to this matter as the plan progresses and information comes to light.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO3538	Mrs C Bray				Object	Re: Land at Battlesteads, Alton I would like to submit the above land to be considered for selection when the Council decides on the final development sites. Below are reasons why I think this land would be the best option, and have the least impact on the village. 1. Existing ribbon development adjoining the site boundary, therefore not breaking into open countryside. 2. Adequate road frontage to allow access point and visibility splays. 3. Easy access to foul and surface water sewers. 4. Gently sloping agricultural land, only suitable for grazing. 5. Suitable for mix of affordable and open market housing. (photos of the site submitted)	- The site was identified as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. - Site identified in the L & SCA as being important to the setting of the settlement. Steeply sloping. Not considered suitable for development due to its location and relationship to the village.
PO9551		Alton Orchard Action Group	Mr M Sutcliffe		Object	Summary - see attached Housing Site Option AL024 Alton Orchard Action Group (AOAG) was formed with the aim of securing the future of the last traditional orchard in Alton. The site was previously identified as a housing option and although not a preferred housing allocation it is coded as a possible reserve site. This possible status is objected to for the following reasons: a) Ecology - its unique and significant feature is its ecological importance as a traditional orchard. It is a Priority Habitat within the Bio-diversity Action Plan and European Habitat Directive. The Council has now changed a temporary TPO to a permanent one. Site is protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive and its development would be contrary to the NPPF. b) Landscape - question the statement in the SHLAA that the site is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape and Settlement Setting Assessment. The Council's Churnet Vally Landscape Character Assessment promotes protection of specimen and groups of trees that are significant historically or visually. Development would be contrary to CS policy NE1. c) Conservation - The Council's Conservation Officer has acknowledged the importance of the Orchard and its association with an area of historic market gardens. The trees, dry stone walls and Ivy Cottage were judged worthy of classification as a non-designated heritage asset. Development would be contrary to CS Policies DC2 and DC3. Support the exclusion of AL024 from the preferred sites. Now the TPO has been confirmed consider that the site should be designated 'not suitable' rather than a 'reserve site'.	The site is not a proposed site allocation

Alton

Question 41 – Do you have any other comments regarding Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO570	Mr Paul Holdcroft				Support	Bagnall The strategy of providing 30 dwellings p.a. for infill in the smaller rural areas appears more realistic and appropriate there to than the previously specific identification of larger sites, and thus mini estates, in some of the smaller villages, which would have ruined their characters and demonstrably been against overwhelming public opinion, strongly expressed in some cases. If this revision be the approved result after final consultation then the Council is to be congratulated on its revised approach as a thoughtful compromise in respect of many of its smaller villages.	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9 878	Mrs H W Williams				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 911	Mr Luke Pointon				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 915	Mrs Elizabeth Barratt				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 929	Mr John Mellor				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 891	Ms Claire E Pointon				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 902	Ms Ann Meehan				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 919	Mr W Ridgeway				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 933	Mrs C Symes				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 937	Mrs J Dulson				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 906	Mr And Mrs Jepson				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	
PO9 896	Mr D Wooliscroft				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 886	Mr J Judges				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 882	Mr D Beakes				BM0 13	Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO1 138	Mr and Mrs S Stanlake				BM0 13	Object	As residents of Rudyard Road, Biddulph Moor we object to the proposed plans to build up to 45 dwellings between Rudyard Road and Hot Lane To build an "estate" on this land would eradicate the village status. We are proud of our village and would hate to see such a dramatic change. Traffic is already a problem on Rudyard Road, and should the proposal go ahead that would mean an extra 45+vehicles using the road. In most cases a vehicle is necessary to get to work etc. as the local bus service would not be adequate. The village school would not be able to cope with extra influx of pupils. The whole infrastructure of the village would be affected. We understand that a preferred option has been put to SMDC. If plans to build have to go ahead we would prefer this option which is to use "infill" sites.	• The Highway Authority does not raise any insurmountable issues in relation to development of this site – footpaths can be provided as part of a development scheme. • The total number of of houses proposed on all sites for the village is 45, BM13 would only comprise part of this • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas • Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites need to be included. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan
PO4 629	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			BM0 13	General comment	BM013 (fronting Rudyard Road and Parklands) - Only use land fronting parklands and Rudyard Road. Housing only 1 deep (Needs further consultation), recommended for inclusion. Do not recommend inclusion of whole site as consider there should be no large scale development in	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Biddulph Moor.	
PO1 129	Miss J.M. Gibson				BM0 13	Object	further to the proposed plans for the land between park farm and parklands biddulph moor, this land is prone to flooding and some of the properties around it so this would mean that building more properties on this land would cause more flooding to the properties already here some of which have already had to install water pumps to try to stem the flooding problem, more hard surfaces mean more flooding. the traffic situation turning out at the end of parklands is a blind dangerous road junction, there are a few residents whom have caravans and motorhomes so this would also be a problem as there would be more vehicles on the parklands parking on the roadside which means that the caravans and motorhomes would not be able to get past, also the amenities on biddulph moor will not stand any more houses as we often get power cuts , it often blows the manhole covers off down woodhouse lane when we have heavy rain fall because the grids can't cope with the amount of water this also means that the properties on the parklands also become flooded because the grids on the parklands cant cope with the amount of water and the brook also can't cope as this also floods over into the property at the bottom of the parklands, also there is no mains gas supply	- The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues - See response to PO1138 regarding traffic issues and infrastructure
PO1 131	Miss E. Gibson				BM0 13		further to the proposed plans for the land between park farm and parklands biddulph moor, this land is prone to flooding and some of the properties around it so this would mean that building more properties on this land would cause more flooding to the properties already here some of which have already had to install water pumps to try to stem the flooding problem, more hard surfaces mean more flooding. the traffic situation turning out at the end of parklands is a blind dangerous road junction, there are a few residents whom have caravans and motorhomes so this would also be a problem as there would be more vehicles on the parklands parking on the roadside which means that the caravans and motorhomes would not be able to get past, also the amenities on biddulph moor will not stand any more houses as we often get power cuts , it often blows the manhole covers off down woodhouse lane when we have heavy rain fall because the grids can't cope with the amount of water this also means that the properties on the parklands also become flooded because the grids on the parklands cant cope with the amount of water and the brook also can't cope as this also floods over into the property at the bottom of the parklands, also there is no mains gas supply	See response to PO1129 regarding flooding and PO1138 regarding traffic issues and infrastructure
PO5	Mr Colin				BM0	Object	further to the proposed plans for the land between park	See response to PO1129 regarding flooding and PO1138 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
17	Gibson				13		farm and parklands biddulph moor, this land is prone to flooding and some of the properties around it so this would mean that building more properties on this land would cause more flooding to the properties already here some of which have already had to install water pumps to try to stem the flooding problem, more hard surfaces mean more flooding. the traffic situation turning out at the end of parklands is a blind dangerous road junction, there are a few residents whom have caravans and motorhomes so this would also be a problem as there would be more vehicles on the parklands parking on the roadside which means that the caravans and motorhomes would not be able to get past, also the amenities on biddulph moor will not stand any more houses as we often get power cuts , it often blows the manhole covers off down woodhouse lane when we have heavy rain fall because the grids can't cope with the amount of water this also means that the properties on the parklands also become flooded because the grids on the parklands cant cope with the amount of water and the brook also can't cope as this also floods over into the property at the bottom of the parklands, also there is no mains gas supply	traffic issues and infrastructure
PO1 133	Mrs J.E. Gibson				BM0 13	Object	further to the proposed plans for the land between park farm and parklands biddulph moor, this land is prone to flooding and some of the properties around it so this would mean that building more properties on this land would cause more flooding to the properties already here some of which have already had to install water pumps to try to stem the flooding problem, more hard surfaces mean more flooding. the traffic situation turning out at the end of parklands is a blind dangerous road junction, there are a few residents whom have caravans and motorhomes so this would also be a problem as there would be more vehicles on the parklands parking on the roadside which means that the caravans and motorhomes would not be able to get past, also the amenities on biddulph moor will not stand any more houses as we often get power cuts , it often blows the manhole covers off down woodhouse lane when we have heavy rain fall because the grids can't cope with the amount of water this also means that the properties on the parklands also become flooded because the grids on the parklands cant cope with the amount of water and the brook also can't cope as this also floods over into the property at the bottom of the parklands, also there is no mains gas supply	See response to PO1129 regarding flooding and PO1138 regarding traffic issues and infrastructure
PO2 917	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire			BM0 13	General comment	In Biddulph Moor site BM013 should access onto Rudyard Road as Hot Lane is very narrow in places. However, consideration could be given to access onto Parklands with	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
		County Council					improvements.	
PO4 38	Miss Philippa Whalley				BM0 13	Object	The amended site allocation which recommends housing fronting Hot Lane is unsuitable for housing. Hot Lane is single track in one direction, and narrow for the remaining half of it in the other direction. Additional traffic would place a burden on this narrow road and would pose an additional safety threat to children attending the local primary school in School lane and also those walking to the Recreation Ground in Hot Lane. The section of BM013 adjoining the Parklands makes reasonable sense given the access onto the existing estate of the Parklands.	See response to PO1138 regarding highways
PO1 388	Mr and Mrs I. Turner				BM0 13	Object	This area should be retained as green belt. This has good agricultural land which is on regular basis. It gives open views which extend far beyond its boundaries. The positioning of the houses in its location shown would destroy the land drains which exist the positioning of the building particularly in the lowest areas of land would undoubtedly cause additional flooding to that which already exists I enclose a amended plan which spreads the traffic more evenly around the village which would spread the traffic more instead of having increased traffic in one area	- The land in question is within the Green Belt. The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). Two assessments of this site were carried out; both considered there was potential to consider the site for development as its contribution to green belt purposes were moderate. The first assessment in 2015 looked at the larger site from Site Options consultations and found it was first preference for release from the green belt over sites BM014a & BM014b, the second 2016 looked at the southern half of the site opposite Parklands it recommended there was potential for Green Belt release although it recognised that the absence of a northwestern boundary could be problematic - See response to PO1138 regarding highways and the need for site allocations and PO1133 regarding flooding
PO4 714	Ms Karena Lawson				BM0 13	Object	To whom it may concern, I have filled & returned my form expressing my thoughts on the 3 options offered. However, I felt it only right to follow on with an email as there wasn't really many options. I really cannot understand how the site on Rudyard Road / Hot Lane has even been considered as a suitable site to build new homes. the reason I say this is that Rudyard Road regularly floods when we have a heavy downpour & numerous houses have previously been flooded (some on a few occasions) the flooding happens on Rudyard Road & leading into Parklands. I can categorically state the above as fact as I live on Rudyard Road & have done so for many years. I was also informed by previous occupants to Parks Farm that there is a covenant in the deeds which states that no development would be permitted on the land? With this said please could you explain how the covenant can be ignored?	See response to PO1133 regarding flooding
PO1 136	Mr & Mrs J & S Heath				BM0 13		We are writing to strongly object to the proposed building of 45 dwellings between Rudyard Road and Hot Lane. We have been residents here for the past 17 years and moved here to enjoy a semi rural location in a quiet village position. We are greatly disturbed at the proposal that the homes would all	Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							be built in the one location creating an 'housing estate' directly opposite ourselves. This would impact on the vicinity and the residents surrounding the area. Reasons for objection: ~ there would be a considerable amount of noise and traffic during and after building ~ the drains are inadequate the road is already prone to flooding during wet periods ~ the power supply particularly on Rudyard Road already struggles to be maintained – the power has been off 3 times in the last week, so a confined building of property would add more disruption ~ the school is full to capacity ~ there is a concern that if all the properties are built together this would create more than required, therefore surplus empty accommodation. There is already an adequate amount of varied properties available in the area for sale ~ green belt land should be protected and if absolutely necessary building should be kept to a minimum ~ there is a lack of public transport to Biddulph Moor – particularly if you wish to travel after 5.00pm which most working adults/students are required to We feel the proposal by the local council to distribute the houses throughout the village (in fill) would be more in keeping with the village and enable a more natural process through local builders and self build properties.	(covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations See response to PO1133 regarding flooding, the need for site allocations, infrastructure, and PO1388 regarding the green belt
PO1 428	Mr and Mrs I Beech				BM0 13	Object	We object to the proposals for the following reasons. Additional traffic it will create, when Hot Lane is already used as a rat run in preference to people using Rudyard Road. Hot Lane is already dangerous because it is so narrow and the junction at the top of Hot Lane is already tricky, whether exiting or entering Hot Lane and a permanent structure where it is proposed to be sited, will only add to this and obscure drivers views even more, plus the parked cars created by the residents.	See response to PO1138 regarding highways
PO4 88	Mr Michael Nevitt				BM0 13	Object	We recently attended the consultation at Biddulph Town Hall and came away dispirited by the lack of proper answers to our questions and what we believed to be genuine and serious issues relating to the proposal to build 4 bungalows on the former green belt land opposite the 8 houses that make up the Parklands community. We were speaking to Councillor Jones and we felt that he had already made-up his own mind on the issue and was not prepared to consider our wishes. Perhaps his reasoning is that we are a small community in voting terms and do not have the manpower to launch a serious objection to the proposals. For this reason we have submitted the relevant detail to you. Half the residents of Parklands have lived there in excess of 35 years and many years ago we took upon ourselves to plant trees, flowers and to maintain the verges and the stream together with its wild life. This was then a neglected area,	- The land is in private ownership and the landowner is willing to develop the site for residential development - See response to PO1129 regarding flooding and PO1138 regarding traffic issues - Site BM013 also includes part of the land fronting Hot Lane

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							for many years SMDC would not adopt this strip of land and whilst a contractor does now occasionally cut the grass with a strimmer, we, the residents, maintain its upkeep. I refer you to recent photographs of this verge and the trees. We would also point out that with the climate change experienced throughout the country, from which Biddulph Moor is not immune, we now regularly have a tidal wave of water which comes down Rudyard Road and from the grounds of Parks Farm and regularly flushes down the road flooding the road and properties. I refer you to recent photographs of the flooding and the water draining from Parks Farm, even on a dry day. Concreting over more of the land to build houses and drives onto Parklands will simply worsen the situation and in the event of more serious flooding we will hold the council and its servants responsible for the damage to our properties as this has been brought to your attention countless times. At times, getting in and out of Parklands is difficult due to vehicles from Rudyard Road parking at the head of the cul-de-sac. Regularly vehicles attending a property on Rudyard Road park on the pavement making it difficult for our children and grand children to visit and stay on the pavement provided for their prams. In view of all these issues relating to Parklands, we asked Councillor Jones why you needed to build on the field rather than use the bigger strip of land off Hot Lane where there are no trees to tear down, no streams to cross and less damage to the environment. Councillor Jones said that Hot Lane was too narrow. I therefore suggested widening it was less impactful than what was planned for Parklands. He simply would not consider it. Councillor Jones also said that the field in question, accessed by a large swept entrance and gate off Hot Lane, offered some of the finest views on Biddulph Moor and if houses were build on this land he would want to own one. This part of the field offers potential for more houses, widening the road from the Village Hall to the Foxhounds is hardly a serious challenge but this alternative suggestion fell on deaf ears. If the proposal for Parklands does continue in its present form then we will recommend to the residents that we take legal advice over the flooding issue and speak with the Environmental Agency regarding the damage to the verge its mature trees and the wild life. Regarding "the finest views on Biddulph Moor", Parks Farm has chosen to surround the property with tall conifers. We understand that residents of both Rudyard Road and Parklands have asked the owners to keep the trees trimmed to a reasonable height as their view towards Cheshire has already being restricted. The owners said that they would deal with the matter but choose not to	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							trim the conifers. With a possible 5 years of further growth, the proposed houses to be built on this plot will spend their mornings in the shadow of these conifers. We were unable to get our points across during the meeting at the Town Hall, hence this letter and a small selection of photographs that illustrate the points that we were trying to make, unsuccessfully.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9 880	Mrs H W Williams		1		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 912	Mr Luke Pointon		2		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 917	Mrs Elizabeth Barratt		3		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 931	Mr John Mellor		4		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 893	Ms Claire E Pointon		5		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 904	Ms Ann Meehan		6		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 922	Mr W Ridgeway		7		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 935	Mrs C Symes		8		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 939	Mrs J Dulson		9		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 908	Mr And Mrs Jepson		10		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	
PO9 899	Mr D Wooliscroft		11		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 888	Mr J Judges		12		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 884	Mr D Beakes		13		Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO4 631	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	14		Support	BM014a - Housing only built fronting New St, recommended for inclusion.	Support noted
PO9 569	Mrs Caroline Philpott				Object	Object to development in Biddulph Moor for the following reasons: Insufficient infrastructure (e.g. doctor's surgeries) in the village to support development; No employment or industry in local towns; Local primary school is full; Traffic congestion at school times presents highway safety problems; Woodhouse Lane and Park Lane have no pavements in parts so are unsafe for pedestrians; Unsold housing stock is available in the area; No natural gas in the village so heating is more costly; Limited public transport; and Access to the village is via narrow winding country lanes used as cut throughs.	• New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered • The Highway Authority does not raise any difficulties in relation to development of this site – footpaths can be provided as part of a development scheme • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need. New employment areas are proposed in nearby Biddulph
PO1 074	Ms Claire E Pointon				Object	Opposition to proposed building site allocations – Biddulph Moor Site allocation part of BM014a & BM014b Copy of letter 25/8/2015 This is as previously stated by yourselves the only green space left in the village of Biddulph Moor. Building here will virtually join Biddulph Moor to Biddulph it will become a built up area and the village will disappear and become part of a town. The roads surrounding this proposed area are totally impractical for more houses. 2 are ancient highways unadopted lanes, single track all the way along very narrow. Chapel Lane is only 1 car passable for at least 75% of its length. New Street from the brow of the hill of Chapel Lane – pulling out on any stretch of New Street is dangerous (I know this for a fact because I do it every day). You cannot see traffic coming over the brow of the hill or round the corner near to Leek Lane entrance. Most cars do not drive at 30 mph speed limit. Cars are continually parked on 1 stretch of this road outside the cottages and at sometimes both sides, again 1 car passable. These roads cannot take more houses and more cars. The amenities in this area are already over insufficient: We already have problems with existing sewers, also periodically power and phone lines Ground this ground has always been wet ground, not suitable for building. Any survey will prove this. This beautiful part of this village, 100's if not 1000's people both local and visitors walk this area, it's in the middle of several public footpaths and is home to large amounts of wildlife including bats and birds (I see them every night). Building here would spoil the entrance to the village; Biddulph Moor is a beautiful part of Staffordshire Moorlands and should remain as it is. Preserved for generations to come	- See response to PO9569 regarding infrastructure - An ecological assessment of the site is being undertaken
PO1 072	Ms Claire E Pointon				Object	Site allocation part of BM014a & BM014b Further to my letter dated 25 th August 2016 – Copy attached outlined in and concerned outlined in this letter. After further proposals and preferred proposed building sites please see below. I the last 5 years planning application for the 2 similar style cottages in the row in the New Street opposite the proposed site was refused by yourself stating that this is only green space left in the Village of Biddulph Moor and needs to be preserved. There is no footpath on the majority of the length of Chapel Lane- the area of Chapel Lane where the building site is proposed has no footpath and is not possible to put in a footpath without demolishing the existing property on this side of the road. It's just too narrow. Chapel Lane is Narrow – It is not possible for 2 cars to pass on the majority of	- A current planning application for development will be determined with regard to the existing policies in the Development Plan. The Preferred Options consultation is to consult on a new Local Plan for the District which will contain revised and updated policies to meet future development needs - See response to PO9569 regarding highways and infrastructure - The site was not assessed in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. An ecological assessment of the site is being undertaken and will inform the suitability of the site for allocation.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Chapel Lane and all of entirety at the proposed building sit end. This lane is already not designed for the amount of cars currently uses it without more. This part of New Street is dangerous – there are now cars parked on both sides at times – Residents parking in both sides of this road leaves this a very dangerous road to drive – now without any extra traffic. Also very dangerous to walk on as you have to walk in the road to go around any parked cars parked on the footpath (I do this every morning!) The road to get to Biddulph Moor – Woodlands Lane and new Street are not designed for the amount of traffic that already them without any additional properties. This is a village! And people have chosen and paid higher house prices because they have chosen to live in a village. Building here will virtually join Biddulph Moor to Biddulph. It will become a town The amenities in this area are already insufficient; we already have problems with the existing water sewers and phone and power lines being over stretched. This is a beautiful part of the village, hundreds if not thousands of locals and visitors walk this area every day, it's in the middle of several public footpaths and is home to large amounts of wildlife and birds . It is the national habitat of bats and as you will be aware all bat species and their homeland are protected by law. All roads surrounding this proposed site are narrow, 1 car passable roads and already busy roads as 1 of the main roads into Biddulph Moor. How can these roads cope with and entrance to housing estate? They can't! We cannot understand how anyone who has been to Biddulph Moor could even consider using this area for building homes even for the safety aspect alone. Building here will totally spoil the entrance to the village; Biddulph Moor is beautiful part of Staffordshire Moorlands, your Staffordshire moorlands and ours. It is the entrance to this beautiful village and should remain as it is preserved for generations to come. We need green space for Biddulph Moor to remain a village and the road is narrow lanes in this area with mainly no footpaths cannot cope with more houses.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object t/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9 881	Mrs H W Williams				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 913	Mr Luke Pointon				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 918	Mrs Elizabeth Barratt				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 932	Mr John Mellor				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 895	Ms Claire E Pointon				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 905	Ms Ann Meehan				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 923	Mr W Ridgeway				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 936	Mrs C Symes				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 940	Mrs J Dulson				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 909	Mr And Mrs Jepson				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9	Mr D				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995)	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object t/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
901	Wooliscroft					Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	
PO9 889	Mr J Judges				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 890	Mr J Judges				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 885	Mr D Beakes				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 570	Mrs Caroline Philpott				Object	Object to development in Biddulph Moor for the following reasons: Insufficient infrastructure (e.g. doctor's surgeries) in the village to support development; No employment or industry in local towns; Local primary school is full; Traffic congestion at school times presents highway safety problems; Woodhouse Lane and Park Lane have no pavements in parts so are unsafe for pedestrians; Unsold housing stock is available in the area; No natural gas in the village so heating is more costly; Limited public transport; and Access to the village is via narrow winding country lanes used as cut throughs.	• New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered • The Highway Authority does not raise any difficulties in relation to development of this site – footpaths can be provided as part of a development scheme • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need. New employment areas are proposed in nearby Biddulph

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO4 632	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Support	BM014b - Housing only built fronting Chapel Lane, recommended for inclusion. Fronting Farmhouse Lane - Build on frontage from existing houses at top to bungalows at bottom 1 deep, recommended for inclusion.	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9 879	Mrs H W Williams				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 910	Mr Luke Pointon				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 916	Mrs Elizabeth Barratt				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 930	Mr John Mellor				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 892	Ms Claire E Pointon				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 903	Ms Ann Meehan				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 920	Mr W Ridgeway				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 934	Mrs C Symes				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 938	Mrs J Dulson				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 907	Mr And Mrs Jepson				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	
PO9 898	Mr D Wooliscroft				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 887	Mr J Judges				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO9 883	Mr D Beakes				Support	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan B – Some infill development along Hot Lane, Rudyard Road, New Street and Chapel Lane i.e. as proposed in the Council's Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation Booklet of April 2016.	Support noted
PO4 630	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group			Support	BM029 - This is linked with BM013 and as has been stated there should be no large development on Biddulph Moor, only build houses 1 deep fronting onto Rudyard Road, recommended for inclusion.	Comments noted
PO9 568	Mrs Caroline Philpott				Object	Object to development in Biddulph Moor for the following reasons: Insufficient infrastructure (e.g. doctor's surgeries) in the village to support development; No employment or industry in local towns; Local primary school is full; Traffic congestion at school times presents highway safety problems; Woodhouse Lane and Park Lane have no pavements in parts so are unsafe for pedestrians; Unsold housing stock is available in the area; No natural gas in the village so heating is more costly; Limited public transport; and Access to the village is via narrow winding country lanes used as cut throughs.	• New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered • The Highway Authority does not raise any difficulties in relation to development of this site – footpaths can be provided as part of a development scheme • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need. New employment areas are proposed in nearby Biddulph
PO4 715	Ms Karena Lawson				Object	To whom it may concern, I have filled & returned my form expressing my thoughts on the 3 options offered. However, I felt it only right to follow on with an email as there wasn't really many options. I really cannot understand how the site on Rudyard Road / Hot Lane has even been considered as a suitable site to build new homes. the reason I say this is that Rudyard Road regularly floods when we have a heavy downpour & numerous houses have previously been flooded (some on a few occasions) the flooding happens on Rudyard Road & leading into Parklands. I can categorically state the above as fact as I live on Rudyard Road & have done so for many years. I was also informed by previous occupants to Parks Farm that there is a covenant in the deeds which states that no development would be permitted on the land? With this said please could you explain how the covenant can be ignored?	- The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - The issue of a covenant on the site will require further investigation to determine if it will impact on site delivery.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9610 PO9636 PO9630 PO9627 PO9625 PO9623 PO9617 PO9616 PO9615 PO9626	Mrs D Hanson Mr L Aston Mr N Jukes Mrs M Hall Mrs D Stewart Mr Hancock Mr B Walley Mr M Tatton Mr G Pointon Mrs L Webb				Object	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan A – A single large development of 40-50 houses between Hot Lane and Rudyard Road.	This option was in the Site Options consultation 2015 the Preferred Options Sites & Boundaries consultation 2016 proposes a smaller sites adjacent to Rudyard Road, Parklands & Hot Lane.
PO9836 PO9833 PO9830 PO9831 PO9851 PO9841 PO9839 PO9794 PO9781 PO9759	Mr Bailey Mrs D Shufflebotham Mrs B Gleeson Mr R Windsor Mr J Heath Mr L Ashworth Mr M Fletcher Mrs J Bertolone P J Thorley Mr David Wilshaw				Object	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan C – All infill sites (maximum of 10-12 units per site) spread more widely around the village (likely to interest local and self builders).	- Some of the suggested sites are included in the Preferred Options Sites & Boundaries consultation 2016 see comments on sites BM014a, BM014b and BM029. - The sites were assessed in the Green Belt Review Additional Site Appraisal 2016 which found the following. Release under Very Special Circumstances would not require the village boundary to be extended and the site to be allocated. - Site off New Street (BM014a) Potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although a northwestern boundary is absent. Retain existing village boundary. - Site off Chapel Lane (BM014b) Potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site. Retain existing village boundary. - Site off Chapel Lane opposite Cottage Lane Not recommended for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded western edge of the site. - Land off Woodhouse Lane Potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although a northern boundary is absent. Retain existing village boundary. - Land off Rudyard & Parklands (Site is a reduced BM013) Potential for release under Exceptional Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although a northwestern boundary is absent. Extend village boundary to incorporate the site. - Land off Rudyard opposite Farmside Lane(BM029)

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Potential for release under Very Special Circumstances reflecting the enclosed character of the site, although sequentially, land off Rudyard Road & Parklands is preferred. Retain existing village boundary reflecting the detached location of the site, although if BM5 were developed, the village boundary could be extended along Rudyard Road. Land off Farmside Lane opposite Broomfields Not recommended for release due to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location and the unbounded southeastern edge of the site
PO1431	Mr G F Waller				Object	BM008 I write to object to the with-drawal of site ref BM008 from the schedule of potentially suitable housing sites for the following reasons:- the site of just 0.57ha is within the green belt but has not had agricultural usage for many years. the 18 dwellings would have no impact on the outlook from existing dwellings or curtail privacy. national building contractors will not be interested in a site for just 18 dwellings, this would leave the door open to local contractors. The dwellings would as a result be designed to suit the location and established housing types. local contractors would employ local labour and source local building materials. the dwellings, a mix of affordable and family homes will provide over 1/3 of the dwellings required in Biddulph Moor. The site is within easy walking distance from shops, post office, school, church and other essential services with no requirement for transport every day needs, the impact on the roads and parking facilities will be limited. the limited development will recognise the visual importance of its location on a main gateway into Biddulph Moor. the development will give the elderly the opportunity to downsize to a home in close proximity of the town centre. I await the outcome with interest.	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO9822	Mr Armitt	Westwood Golf Club			Object	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan C – All infill sites (maximum of 10-12 units per site) spread more widely around the village (likely to interest local and self builders).	See response relevant question in site tables for site specific comments

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1354	Mr R Goodall				Object	BB041 (50 Housing development. Caverswall Old Road) is a late addition to the local plan. Consequently giving local residents less time to be aware of the proposed green belt site. And your proposal of 50 houses. The two proposed/preferred question as above as well as Draycott Old Road 70 new build are to be taken into the greenbelt and not infilling. I question their sustainable viability because of your core strategy criteria with regard to infrastructure. Your two preferred options will create a lot of pressure to the Cheadle Road to Blythe Bridge– 70 new builds) with both sites being either side of that same road, and are both only a short distance from the Junction of Caverswall old road. Caverswall old road/draycott old road are traditional rural roads with narrow widths and the sites will have an impact for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, disabled. Will two new sites provide enough green space to meet environmental /community leisure expectations? In the Forsbrook conurbation once both sites are complete?	- The preparation of the Local Plan is an ongoing process which takes account of consultation responses, the evidence base and national planning policy. The site was suggested following the Site Options stage and was therefore included in the Preferred Options consultation to enable people to comment on it. - The Highway Authority does not raise any objections to the development of this site. They recommend that key junctions will require assessment including Caverswall Rd/A521 and Caverswall Old Rd/A521 and pedestrian links into Blythe Bridge will require consideration - New housing schemes will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping - The Council is undertaking Local Plan viability work which will consider the viability of preferred option sites.
PO9945	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Object	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: Our comments relate to the absence of evidence presented by the Council to justify the need for Green Belt release, in the context of there being alternative land i.e. Blythe Vale, available for development, but not assessed by the Council. Site BB054 is identified for release from the Green Belt for housing, however given the proximity of the River Blythe and the nature of the constrained points of highways access, onto a narrow country lane, we question the appropriateness of this allocated site, compared to the availability, suitability and achievability of Blythe Vale. In summary, we believe that additional housing sites should be identified at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook but also that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for BB054 and BB041. BB054 in particular appears to have additional technical constraints that	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The Green Belt review considered the overall impact on Green Belt purposes of the development to be limited. It found “The high degree of enclosure of this land both physically and visually means that damage to the overall openness of the Green Belt in this location would be limited. Identified in the LCA as making a contribution to the setting of the settlement.” and recommended the site was considered for release it said

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						have yet to be explored.	the site "Could be phased for beyond the Plan period, but given its potential scale would require comprehensive masterplanning which incorporates extensive Green Infrastructure" In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. See response to PO1354 regarding highways
PO638	Mrs Christine Bratt				Object	I am making observations concerning the proposal to include additional housing in Forsbrook; 1. off Caverwall Old Road - this road is a narrow county lane with no public footpath and is liable to flooding. The local school is full to capacity so it would mean more use of transport to get to other local schools not in walking distance. The traffic situation in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge can at best be described as a disaster and when as often happens the A50 is closed it is an absolute nightmare. To suggest an increase in residents is irresponsible. On the grounds of health and safety we should not be encouraging walkers along a road with no footpaths and insufficient room to provide them. 2. Draycott Ol Road - again another country road that would only bring more traffic causing further problems and creating a great health and safety risk. The comments as detailed above also apply. In addition there would need to be major improvement to the drains both rainwater and sewage to cope with the additional burden, as well as increase in health facilities and doctors surgeries.	- See response to PO1354 regarding highways - The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan.
PO9448	mr david totton				Object	I am sending this email objection to proposed construction of houses to the rear of Manifold Road, Forsbrook, Stoke on Trent ST11 9BN ref BB041 field code map 4-13. We have lived in Manifold Road, Forsbrook 48 years and have observed the land mentioned become a habitat for all kinds of wild life, including herons, owls, buzzards, sparrow hawks, woodpeckers, pheasants and all kinds of birds including a family of bats that hunt at night up and down the said field. With construction of houses all this will stop. The roads of Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge are inadequate to take away any more traffic, let alone building traffic, large lorries, machinery etc. The local schools are all overcrowded and children already have to dodge traffic on inadequate footpaths. To get off the estate on to Uttoxeter Road, either down Cheadle Road or Caverswall Road Blythe Bride is impossible most of the time, especially when the train comes through the station. The noise, disruption and pollution plus the mud and sludge, while the building goes on would be disgusting and not good for health.	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • The site was not included in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust consider the site to be good quality semi improved grassland consider it could potentially be of high environmental value & note it is covered by a higher level stewardship scheme. They recommend the site is assessed against the Staffordshire LWS criteria. The results of the ecological assessment of the site will be taken into consideration in determining the suitability of the site for development • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered • Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations
PO9154	Mrs Suzanne				Object	I am writing to object to the proposed	• Property values are not a material

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Whiston					housing development on the field behind Manifold Road off Caverswall Old Road site allocation BB041. We live in Manifold Road and obviously have many personal reasons to object as listed below 1. De-valuation of property prices 2. Loss of view (the reason we brought the house). 3. A lot of children from the street play in the field as it's a safe environment enabling them to enjoy their childhood and not be stuck playing on computers. 4. We only have small back gardens this is not so much of an issue because of the sense of space having a green field behind your home. 5. Disturbance from prolonged building. Not great having a building site behind your home. 6. Being overlooked from the rear of the property. There are also reasons to help protect the village 1. Caverswall road is very narrow and is a single lane road in parts where passing places have to be used. 2. Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge cannot handle the current volume of traffic if any further strain is put on it the roads would not cope. 3. Caverswall road is already used as a cut through as people cannot get through Blythe Bridge so other villages especially Caverswall would get a higher volume of traffic from more people cutting out the traffic in Blythe. 4. A lot of people walk through the lane going to Foxfield it would make it even more unsafe. 5. Wildlife in the field would be destroyed. Buzzards, Owls, Bats, field mice are often spotted. 6. All local schools are often over subscribed. 7. Put a strain on the local amenities 8. Its GREENBELT.	planning consideration. • Loss of view is not a material planning consideration • New housing schemes will maintain existing pedestrian links as well as considering new links where appropriate. Depending on size developments may need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping. • Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application • See response to PO9448 regarding disruption during construction work, wildlife & school capacity/infrastructure • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9945 regarding green belt
PO182	Mr Brian Hannah				Object	I chose to live in a village surrounded by countryside. The proposal of housing over my back fence will feel like an intrusion into my personal life. Road systems around Forsbrook cannot support the present volume of traffic without adding to the problem. Housing creates drainage and flooding issues in an area already on a hillside and additional flooding issues will result lower down in the village around the railway station and main A50 highway. The proposed site currently has a public	• See response to PO9154 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to PO9154 regarding footpath/recreation use • Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						footpath running through it where a pleasant walk can be taken to absorb the flora and fauna which presently resides in those fields. Why destroy more countryside when Brown belt areas are available to build houses?	settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO29	Miss Gabrielle Bailey				Object	I object. More houses mean more people and traffic which cannot be supported without complimentary infrastructure. The main roads through Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook are already gridlocked at certain times of day with queues right back into Forsbrook waiting at the crossroads to Blythe Bridge. People park all the way down the main road in Blythe Bridge which means queues down the road as it's single file. Add this to waiting for the railway crossing at Blythe Bridge and what should be a short journey turns into one where you need to pack sandwiches! With new sites for housing and a massive area now allocated for building to support employment how on earth are residents supposed to get to work or indeed hope to cross Cheadle Road in Forsbrook village? It's dangerous and time consuming as it is. I haven't seen anything on the table as solutions to the infrastructure problems which need to be in place before or alongside any addition to the population. In addition this is green belt land, which I fundamentally object to building on when there are so many brownfield sites available.	• See response to PO9448 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO182 regarding the need to build on greenfield sites
PO1435	Mrs S J Malpass				Object	I refer to the preferred options sites - development boundaries consultation and the housing requirement for Blythe Bridge. In particular I refer to your recent preferred options for 50 and 70 No new house sites, viz Caverswall Old Road (BB041) and Draycott Old Road respectively, to fulfil proposed 120 No new homes allocated for the next 15 year development plan. I consider the impact of these two close new build sites will contribute to an over populated area around Forsbrook, and they will contravene your core strategy policy which	• See response to PO9448r regarding infrastructure • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO182 regarding the need for site allocations

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						is to ensure current infrastructure is not compromised. Both your preferred, proposed sites are in such close proximity to one another it raises the question how the foreseeable impact on Forsbrook, with inevitable heavy traffic flow through the road network of Forsbrook/Cheadle/Blythe Bridge, plus surrounding road links, will cope as these developments mature. There would also be probable, substantial pressure on other necessary infrastructure amenities in Forsbrook because of your proposed concentrated preferred options, as a random example - pedestrian/leisure requirements, utility services, deliveries (expected on-line traffic that would be required to service everyday expectations of 21st century residents to 120 no homes). Site BB041 proposed contradicts your rejection of other green belt sites, especially when you consider the above points and traffic on the Forsbrook to Cheadle Road. BB041 is also further from Blythe Bridge shops, Doctors, railway station etc than other development options. A more proportionate, fairer and transparent 'spread' of new housing in Blythe Bridge could still provide more community leisure facilities instead of saturating a 15 year allocation in two close proximity clustered sites. I also consider BB041's very late application has not been given the same period of consultation for the SMDC public who wish to comment. Even if you should widen accesses, the exit routes will cause great concern, especially BB041. Over a 15 year period I would have expected a fairer distribution of preferred sites, with possibilities for mid to long term land bank, and I am quite frankly bewildered by your preferred, proposed sites for the next development plan. Once again I object to 70 no new build in Draycott Old Road and 50 no new build in Caverswall Old Road (BB041) for the aforementioned reasons.	
PO9158	Mr Peter Addison				Object	I wish to inform you of my objection of the proposed development for 50 houses on Caverswall Old Road, Blythe Bridge (SHLAA	• See response to PO 1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9945 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						site BB041) The site is not suitable for such a development for many reasons. I have been a resident in Manifold Road, Forsbrook since our house was built in 1968. I have witnessed many developments in the Village. Some good and other not. I do not live in which I at first described as a village. With many similar developments it has already taken its toll in its local services. The traffic which builds up during each day causes considerable problems. The situation of the Railway Station causes delays in both Uttoxeter Road and Stallington Lane and the present volume of traffic from Caverswall Road joining Uttoxeter Road. This causes a build up not only in Uttoxeter Road with traffic tailing back into Cheadle Road in the village of Forsbrook. The impact of this proposed development will cause danger, delays and over capacity of traffic in the surrounding highway network. Caverswall Old Road can only be described as a country lane were parts single traffic can pass. Caverswall Road is marginally better and narrows only in two dangerous parts. The junction of these two roads is a nightmare. It is just waiting for another accident to occur. The speed that some drivers swing into the lane from the direction of the Foxfield Railway site will one day cause a fatality. Caverswall Old Road is boarded with Hawthorn hedgerows and with a number of large trees that have been there for hundreds of years all of which are protected by law. The lane is used by many residents of the area which causes concern for the safety of pedestrians, school children, older people walking their dogs, and visitors to both the Foxfield Steam Railway and the popular Heath House Farm and garden centre. If this application succeeds the capacity of the likely increase of traffic it certainly would not be able to cope with its demands. It appears that no consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from the proposed site. I also note that the application is located in a defined Green	green belt • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • The consultation is to seek residents views on the proposed changes including those the village boundary and site allocations

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Belt area. I am aware that the development in such areas should be strongly controlled. The review taken by Amec-Foster-Wheeler is flawed I believe that this would probably breach chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework These fields for many years were used by the old farmer both with both sheep and cattle. Following his death it is been only used occasionally the building up of cattle ready for market. At the present time is has been left to nature and being ready to be cut for silage. This has been done twice a year and in doing this is now a paradise for wildflowers attracting many wild creatures including buzzards, pheasants and foxes. The two small pools contains a hive of activity As Caverswall Road is already subject to flooding from the adjoining fields and the Foxfield site. Any further building of houses in the area like the recent rejected application of the building houses off Caverswall Road that is only about 100 yards further along the lane should be rejected for the same reasons. It is interesting that the Local Plan Boundary for Forsbrook seems to have been changed and does not include the other fields adjoining BB041 and the brown field area (former tile, brick yard). Why has this been done without informing the general residents?	
PO9142	Philippa Hackney				Object	I would like to express my disapproval with reference to the proposed housing development (plot BB041) for the reasons below; Green Belt land - should be protected to preserve the local countryside and provide a habitat for wildlife in addition to controlling urban sprawl. It is important that Green Belt land is protected for future generations. The additional road traffic generated to access the proposed development would have a negative impact on the surrounding community (e.g. traffic jams / increased risk of traffic accidents / noise / pollution).	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO9146	Mr Kevin Hackney				Object	I would like to express my disapproval with reference to the proposed housing	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						development (Plot BB041) for the reasons stated below: 1) Greenbelt land should be protected to preserve the local countryside and provide a safe habitat for local wildlife – this can only be preserved by reducing urban sprawl. 2) It is important that greenbelt land is protected for future generations. 3) The additional road traffic generated to access the proposed development would have a negative impact on the surrounding community. For example, the additional traffic would result in severe congestion due to the proposed sites' geographical location and the narrow winding lanes. This would create problems for vehicles wishing to travel either to Blythe Bridge or Caverswall. Obviously this will lead to a rise in both noise and pollution which we are all committed to try and reduce.	• See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9142 regarding pollution
PO9148	Mrs Helen Reid				Object	I would like to object to the above with regard to the option site and boundary at BB041 - land off Caverswall Old Road in Forsbrook, for the following reasons. Use of green belt land Firstly I object to the site being used as it is green belt. Planning guidance states that green belt land should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. At the drop in session I was advised by one of the planners that one of the reasons the land had been identified was because the landowner had made the land available. I do not believe this is a valid enough reason to change green belt boundaries when there is other land which is far better suited for houses and development. It appears to be more of an easy option than an area which has been identified for the right reasons. Destruction of countryside and wildlife habitat The fields are a beautiful part of the village environment with mature trees, hedgrows and grassland which are full of wildlife. (A public footpath is also within the site) There are a large variety of birds which we have the privilege of seeing and listening to whilst in our gardens. We have many common varieties but also sparrow	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife and infrastructure • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO91545 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO638 regarding flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						hawks, kestrels, woodpeckers and golden pheasants. Yesterday we saw an owl. In the pond at the bottom of the field there are herons and frogs. Other wildlife we see are bats, foxes, bees, butterflies, bees, bumblebees, hedgehogs. This wildlife needs to be protected. The State of Nature report in 2013 states that many of the above species are on the decline and action needs to be taken to protect these species. Increase of traffic on already narrow access roads Traffic is a major problem in Forsbrook and has been for many years with many near misses in the village where there is no pedestrian crossing and a blind bend where cars come through too quickly. The building of 100 + houses at the above site and the one off Draycott Old Road I believe would cause major problems in the following areas; - Caverswall Road - at the top near Caverswall Old Road the road has no pavement and is very narrow - more heavy goods vehicles during development and then the added car load from 50+ houses would make this road very dangerous. At the bottom where it meets Uttoxeter Road is also a problem area. Since the station started charging for parking, cars now park all the way up to the bridge on Caverswall Road. This is a major problem now as there are near misses at the bridge where cars are coming up to it on the wrong side of the road and at the bottom where cars are stopped from turning left into Caverswall Road off Uttoxeter Road by queues causing problems on the crossings. More cars using this road could cost lives. - Caverswall old Road - Again this is a road with no pavement and more suited to single lane traffic - the addition of 50 + houses and associated cars would make this road extremely dangerous. - Cheadle Road - at school drop off / pick up times and uptill approx. 6 o'clock this road is extremely congested. It is not uncommon for the queue from Blythe Bridge to be backed up to Blythe Mount Park - this road cannot take any more traffic without causing	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						considerable inconvenience for the residents of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. I understand that sites looked at previously in the Caverswall Road area and top of Caverswall Old Road area were deemed unsuitable due to the poor roads and lack of pavemnets. Site BB041 would present the same issues. School provision The local primary school, Forsbrook primary, is fully subscribed. I understand that Blythe Bridge high school is always over subscribed. What provision would be made for the extra need for school places without increasing class sizes? Drainage issues Manifold Road is on a hill and has in the past had a problem with drainage issues at the bottom. This was rectified by the construction of another drain at the bottom of the road. However the construction of 50 houses on the field is of great concern to me. The natural surface drainage will be greatly reduced and I am concerned what provision would be made to ensure this does not become a problem for the houses on Manifold Road. The field at the bottom of the hill is often waterlogged and there is already a pond at the bottom. Overlooking issues We, as have many of the houses on Manifold Road have large patio doors and conservatories which have been built to enjoy the views of the fields. I am concerned that any development will overlook direct into our houses.	
PO9140	Mr Kevin Reid				Object	I would like to object to the above with regard to the option site and boundary at BB041 - land off Caverswall Old Road in Forsbrook, for the following reasons. Use of green belt land Firstly I object to the site being used as it is green belt. Planning guidance states that green belt land should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. At the drop in session I was advised by one of the planners that one of the reasons the land had been identified was because the landowner had made the land available. I do not believe this is a valid enough reason to change green belt boundaries when there is other land which	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife and infrastructure • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO91545 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO638 regarding flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						is far better suited for houses and development. It appears to be more of an easy option than an area which has been identified for the right reasons. Destruction of countryside and wildlife habitat The fields are a beautiful part of the village environment with mature trees, hedgrows and grassland which are full of wildlife. There are a large variety of birds which we have the privilege of seeing and listening to whilst in our gardens. We have many common varieties but also sparrow hawks, kestrels, woodpeckers and golden pheasants. Yesterday we saw an owl. In the pond at the bottom of the field there are herons and frogs. Other wildlife we see are bats, foxes, bees, grasshoppers, butterflies, bees, bumblebees, hedgehogs. This wildlife needs to be protected. The State of Nature report in 2013 states that many of the above species are on the decline and action needs to be taken to protect these species. I ncrease of traffic on already narrow access roads Traffic is a major problem in Forsbrook and has been for many years with many near misses in the village where there is no pedestrian crossing and a blind bend where cars come through too quickly. The building of 100 + houses at the above site and the one off Draycott Old Road I believe would cause major problems in the following areas; - Caverswall Road - at the top near Caverswall Old Road the road has no pavement and is very narrow - more heavy goods vehicles during development and then the added car load from 50+ houses would make this road very dangerous. At the bottom where it meets Uttoxeter Road is also a problem area. Since the station started charging for parking, cars now park all the way up to the bridge on Caverswall Road. This is a major problem now as there are near misses at the bridge where cars are coming up to it on the wrong side of the road and at the bottom where cars are stopped from turning left into Caverswall Road	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						off Uttoxeter Road by queues causing problems on the crossings. More cars using this road could cost lives. - Caverswall old Road - Again this is a road with no pavement and more suited to single lane traffic - the addition of 50 + houses and associated cars would make this road extremely dangerous. - Cheadle Road - at school drop off / pick up times and upto approx. 6 o'clock this road is extremely congested. It is not uncommon for the queue from Blythe Bridge to be backed up to Blythe Mount Park - this road cannot take any more traffic without causing considerable inconvenience for the residents of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. I understand that sites looked at previously in the Caverswall Road area and top of Caverswall Old Road area were deemed unsuitable due to the poor roads and lack of pavements. Site BB041 would present the same issues. The lane is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath and is currently difficult for cars and people to navigate. School provision The local primary school, Forsbrook primary, is fully subscribed. I understand that Blythe Bridge high school is always over subscribed. What provision would be made for the extra need for school places without increasing class sizes? Drainage issues Manifold Road is on a hill and has in the past had a problem with drainage issues at the bottom. This was rectified by the construction of another drain at the bottom of the road. However the construction of 50 houses on the field is of great concern to me. The natural surface drainage will be greatly reduced and I am concerned what provision would be made to ensure this does not become a problem again for the houses on Manifold Road. The land at the bottom of the hill is often waterlogged and there is already a permanent pond at the bottom of the field. Overlooking issues We, as have many of the house on Manifold Road have large patio doors, conservatories which have been built to enjoy the views of the	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						fields. I am concerned that any development will overlook direct into our houses. Proximity to village centre . I understand that the location considered on the basis of proximity to existing facilities. It appears that Blythe Bridge shops has been used as the village centre when in fact the facilities area for Forsbrook (where the considers site sits) is the retail area at the junction of Cheadle Rd and Chapel street. This area has significant retail and transport links.	
PO9112	Mr A Brereton				Object	I would like to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed building on greenbelt land within the Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook area. It is utterly abhorrent that consideration is being given to the destruction of the natural habitat of wildlife in our local area such as badgers, buzzards and newts. Not only will the proposed development devastate emerging vulnerable species, but will massively and detrimentally impact on the quality of life of local residents. In particular, I would like to object to the building of housing on site BB041 (as per map 4:13). The groups for this objection are based upon: Unsuitable access - the narrow lanes and local highways infrastructure are not suitable for greater traffic numbers. The lanes that feed the immediate area surrounding site BB041 are narrow, heavily congested as it is, and prone to severe flooding. Therefore, the proposal to build extra housing, which will lead to further traffic chaos, is unsuitable and based upon unsound judgement. Detrimental impact on the environment - the building of houses on site BB041 will massively impact on local wildlife, as there are badger sets in the field and buzzards nesting nearby. Also, newts have been spotted living in the pool at the bottom of the field. However, the greatest detrimental impact will be on the quality of life of local residents who rely upon the open views and peaceful location to cope with the stresses of life. An suitable alternative site would be 459 Utttoxeter	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response to PO9154 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO1354 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						road as the access routes are far better, and the impact on local wildlife/residents minimised.	
PO9109	Mr and Mrs R Bryant				Object	I would like to strongly object to the Planning Applications for housing development on the Caverswall Old Road site for the following reasons: Road access – very narrow lanes – Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road. The installation of utilities could be difficult. Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge have been subjected to flooding in the past. If these houses are built on the proposed site there would be no soakaway for run-off of rain. Ecology of the site, ie buzzards nesting etc. Special wildflower meadow left to nature and cut for silage only. We get a wide variety of wild life in the fields. The field is unique as it is used at present as farmers would call “set aside”. It is mown once a year for silage and therefore the flora has time to grow and set seed. The hedgerows are Hawthorn and have been there a very long time as have the trees and these have preservation orders on them and should be kept at all costs. These are not “prairie” fields like a lot over the county but extremely old style fields which need preserving. The field which is the site of the old brickworks seems to have been discounted. This is waste land and should be used for housing before the fields in the vicinity. Has this been rejected because of more influential intervention I think this is very possible. Green belt – does this mean nothing anymore? We will have no green belt left in the whole country if the Government and Councils have their way. I am very conscious that a lot of people do not think about the impact of ecology but Britain will become a concrete jungle with nothing of our past left. 50 houses are proposed for the site as I understand it, and that could mean the possibility of 100 cars – working on 2 cars per family. Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge already have a huge problem with parking at present so this would make things much worse. I appreciate houses are necessary	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO182 regarding the need for site allocations • The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						but surely there are some derelict sites that can be used that do not interfere with greenbelt and people who cherish this. All over the area of Stoke and Staffs Moorlands there are these sites which have not been used for anything for years and are not greenbelt ie Stoke's old football ground, British Steels' massive site, Twyfords, Boltons in Froghall etc. Some of these sites have been derelict for years. When Stallington Hospital site was used for housing it effected very little. This proposed development effects a lot of people. Has the person or persons who are making the final decision visited the site? I hope you will give this objection due consideration and look at other less unique sites. I and the people who care are disgusted with the way this has been handled. No information to house holders affected I was told this was in the local paper and on the local radio station and on tiny notices on one notice board. A lot of us do not read or listen to these. Does this mean we have to buy a paper every day and listen to the radio every day in the hope that we hear about planning proposals? The rural communities are being put under real pressure over this and I think its time somebody realised this.	
PO9451	Ms Julie Lyons				Object	I would like to take this opportunity to object to any further building in our village, as previously stated in my earlier objection, the services and the infrastructure cannot cope. I have lived in the village for the last 17 years and I feel that the quality of village life has somewhat diminished. Forsbrook has already lost it's identity and has merged with Blythe Bridge, I don't want to end up living in a suburb of Stoke on Trent as I fear that will be the end result for our neighbour Caverswall. I cannot understand why the Council (government) want to cram developments into unsuitable locations, it should be looking for new locations and building the services and infrastructure to match. The site that has been put forward in the village will cause traffic issues on a daily basis. There is	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • The Local Plan will contain an affordable housing policy requiring a percentage of houses to be affordable

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						also a discrepancy as to the amount of houses that Staffs Moorlands requires and the differences between the two schemes that have been published haven't been fully explained to the public. If there are to be houses built will there be a restriction as to sold to local people or will it be as I fear they are sold to anyone, thus causing further problems with future housing. There has already been one large development and several smaller developments built between the two villages in the last ten years, swelling the population even further.	
PO9527	Mr K Tunnicliffe				Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of	• See response to PO9142 regarding pollution • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to question 40 regarding the traveller site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	
PO9533	Mr C Salt				Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all	• See response to PO9142 regarding pollution • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to question 40 regarding the traveller site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	
PO9460	Mrs P Marsden				Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific	• See response to question 40 regarding the traveller site • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9142 regarding pollution • See response to PO9142 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9156	Mr Mathew Russell				Object	I write in reference to the above site. As a resident of Caverswall road i have concerns over the proposed housing site which will have a huge effect on the infrastructure on caverswall road, surrounding roads and surrounding areas. Traffic on caverswall road already as i high volume of traffic as cars cut through caverswall old road to skip the junction of cheadle road and uttoxeter road. i live on a really narrow bend on caverswall road and find it difficult and dangerous to pull from my driveway onto caverswall road. the increase in traffic will only increase the danger on this section of road. At the bottom of caverswall Road which adjoins uttoxeter road as a major drainage problem and floods frequently. Since Blythe Bridge railway station introduced parking fees rail users are using caverswall road as a free car park which causes congestion point at the junction. The Proposed site will only add to the already over congested road. Schools in the local area are over subscribed St Filomenas, Forsbrook Infants both rejecting siblings at the same school as there brothers and sisters with parents having to do multiple school runs increasing more traffic on the local roads. The Fields Surrounding our area of natural beauty and wildlife which as residents paid a premium to live in these areas. As i understand the proposed Traveller site TR002 The owner of the said land is not willing to sell the land as a traveller site but is willing to sell for development of housing. It makes sense to me that TR002 should be the development site for the mass housing and relocate the travellers site to a different area of the moorlands where the infrastructure is in place.	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9488 regrading infrastructure and wildlife • See response to Question 40 regarding the travellers site
PO9138	Miss Laura Ditcher				Object	I write to you with my firm objections and disappointment with regards to the planning proposal for a mass property development on Green Belt land in Forsbrook. Ref: BB041. My sheer disbelief stems from the proposal to build on Green belt land which is outside of the existing development boundary, potentially putting	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9945 regarding the green belt • See response to PO9488 regrading infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						the countryside in jeopardy. My main concern is also the infrastructure costs. Caverswall Old Road is a narrow Lane which is already a hazardous area at times with the amount of traffic that passes through the lane which is also single track in places. Vastly increasing the volume of traffic on that lane would only make the situation detrimental to all involved. This brings me onto the additional traffic & proximity to the railway line & the junction. I don't believe with the extra traffic these surrounding areas would be able to cope, leading to major congestion within the proximity. Then there's the lack of appropriate access to the development, additional noise pollution, no footpaths or street lighting and general safety for residents. Other issues which form my objections are the major strain on local amenities. Local schools are already averaging 30 pupils plus per class, waiting upto 2 weeks for a Doctors appointment or longer to see a dentist. I genuinely believe there are far more appropriate places for a property development around the Staffordshire Moorlands area which wouldn't have a direct affect on people, families or Greenbelt land.	
PO9151	Mr Jon Bratt				Object	I write to you with my firm objections and disappointment with regards to the planning proposal for a mass property development on Green Belt land in Forsbrook. Ref: BB041. My sheer disbelief stems from the proposal to build on Green belt land which is outside of the existing development boundary, potentially putting the countryside in jeopardy. Caverswall Old Road is a narrow Lane which is already a hazardous area at times with the amount of traffic that passes through the lane which is also single track in places. Vastly increasing the volume of traffic on that lane would only make the situation detrimental to all involved. This brings me onto the additional traffic & proximity to the railway line & the junction. I don't believe with the extra traffic these surrounding areas would be able to cope,	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9945 regarding the green belt • See response to PO9488 regrading infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						leading to major congestion within the proximity. Then there's the lack of appropriate access to the development, additional noise pollution, no footpaths or street lighting and general safety for residents. Other issues which form my objections are the major strain on local amenities. Local schools are already averaging 30 pupils plus per class, waiting upto 2 weeks for a Doctors appointment.	
PO876	mr jonathan broadhurst				Object	If affordable housing is needed in this area, this type of housing would not fit in this the surrounding housing. Building more housing in this area will place an additional strain on the local infrastructure, including the highways and schools. The lane adjacent to this site is very narrow with a number of dangerous narrow points along it. The additional vehicles that this number of extra houses would place upon the local highways would cause a significant problem. These narrow lanes were not designed for the amount of traffic currently using them, they cannot cope with a significant increase. Caverswall Road does not have pavements on both sides of the road, making it a necessity to continually cross over. Pedestrians would be put at more risk through the increased traffic. There are a number of blind bends on this road that are dangerous enough as it is. Exiting Caverswall Road at the busy junction with Uttoxeter Road by the level crossing is already hazardous and difficult to do given the current amount of traffic. Any increase of users coming from the proposed housing on this site would cause significant problems and increased dangers, especially for the children walking to and from Blythe High and Springcroft Primary. There are no pedestrian crossings near to this junction.	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9488 regrading infrastructure • Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan which seek to ensure that appropriate for the location and does not harm the character of the area
PO1276	Mr Yendole	Forward Planning Stafford Borough Council			Support	In terms of the Green Belt releases on the northern side of Blythe Bridge for housing development the Borough Council supports these proposals in the Preferred Options document .	• Support noted
PO9518	J.M. Belcher				Object	In the knowledge of the proposed developments, preferred options to meet	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						your required housing need in Blythe Bridge, these two sites will significantly outweigh the benefits of your core strategy requirements. The closeness of the two sites (BB054 and BB041) will undoubtedly have an enormous impact on roads, traffic and transport as well as noise levels to surrounding environment, due to the large clusters of proposed housing. The roads referred to are already narrow, have no footpaths in places, and lead to junctions that are already with limited visibility and safe access. the schools would possibly cope but the concentration of these two developments has a longer, larger impact to everyday living. The landscape for these numbers of houses will again be affected by lessening natural wildlife and birdlife. In one statement you want to meet sustainability, control of environment issues but consider two heavily numbered housing clusters to be more preferable in meeting your SHLAA, but will surely have a detrimental impact on all sections of the existing community because you have extended your housing needs in two close sites instead of spreading the housing needs (over the next plan period) in a more fair, proportionate, environmentally friendly future for the area. I hope you will consider the above and view your current proposals, in view of the late addition of land BB041 to your Local Plan in a transparent, democratic, fair way.	See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife
PO1262	Mr W Harper				Object	Insufficient infrastructure and insufficient drainage this was mooted in the late 1960s and was turned down then for the same reasons the worst place a travellers site boundaries by Blythe Bridge village hall a children's play area and 2 mot garage within a short distance	See responses to question 40 regarding the traveller site
PO9631	Mrs K Robertson				Object	Letter objecting to Preferred Options sites TR002, and BB041 (correspondence sent to Bill Cash MP attached): site currently designated as green belt land, and is therefore unsuitable for a development of this scale [Government NPPF Policy]. site is a massive and very obtrusive development which would be to the permanent	- See response to PO9945 regarding green belt - The Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study concluded the site was of low landscape sensitivity it stated "Site comprises fields to the north of the settlement, sloping down from Caverswell Old Road towards the

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						detriment of the rural landscape site would impact on the landscape setting of the area. For this reason should be categorised a 'C' [like BB049 and BB064 were] There are no pavements for pedestrians on Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road in the vicinity of B041. All road junctions in the vicinity of BB041 are very narrow..large sections of Caverswall Old Road are simply too narrow to accommodate existing traffic, let alone 70 new houses, this restriction to the flow of traffic extends for at least 300m down Caverswall Road towards Blythe Bridge station, Caverswall road could not accommodate the traffic generated by a development at BB041. the road junction between Caverswall Road and Uttoxeter Road is dangerous to both motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, as there is no clear view of oncoming traffic when attempting to exit Caverswall Road and make a right turn (west) across the level crossing on Uttoxeter Road. Any increase in traffic will lead to further accidents. site would be detrimental to the rural character and quality of the area. The visual and acoustic privacy of existing immediate residents will be decimated.. [Letter to Bill Cash also attached re-iterating objections].	settlement edge (rear of properties on Caverswell Road). The site is generally screened by existing development; vegetation (particularly the hedgerow on Caverswell Old Road); and topography, as the land continues to rise to a ridge to the north of the site, thus screening long distance views from this direction. Development of the site would fit in well within the existing settlement form, and would create a well defined, vegetated settlement edge.” • See response PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO876 regarding scale of development
PO1368	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			Object	Map 4.13 - Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook - Forsbrook green belt release site - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation has been assessed in respect of the Grade II listed building Forsbrook Hall Farmhouse. Further information is required.	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt
PO1271	Mr J Millar				General comment	Miller Proposed housing- cavers wall road extremely narrow + could not take any further volume of traffic. Extremely dangerous all ready for pedestrians. Ref TR002 – Community area small not fit for purpose of gypsy camp + roads surrounding area not fit for caravans etc already traffic congestion which is extremely heavy	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See responses to question 40 regarding traveller sites
PO484	Mr D Wright				Object	Please accept and note this e-mail as my formal objection to the proposed application to build private dwellings on	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9448 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						plot BB041. My objections, although not exhaustive are:- The only access road (Caverswall Old Road) is a single lane carriageway, and has no pavements. With the above road the only access point, a significant increase in traffic movement would be realised, along with what realistically would be an increase in potential accidents both vehicle to vehicle and more frightening, directly with the general public travelling by foot or bike. This road is currently used by a number of pedestrians from the village as two popular local recreational facilities are located along this road, Heath House Farm and Foxfield Railway, and the increase of traffic on this route would dramatically increase the risk of serious injury to local people. BB041 and its adjacent field are pasture lands and house a significant amount of wildlife. With the entire proposed area being surrounded by at least a dozen oak trees, old and all holding preservation orders. Buzzards have been nesting for several years in the above mentioned oak trees, along with pheasants, herons, not to mention numerous plants, shrubs and hedgrows. There would have to be a major survey and infrastructure work undertaken to assess the possibility of building on this land. This would have long term consequences on both land and local wildlife that could be damaged forever. The proposal for building on BB041 would definitely realise a reduction in grazing areas for local cattle. This proposal brings too many infrastructure issues to make it a sound proposal, surely there are more suitable and safer areas to develop within the Forsbrook/Blythe Bridge area that have better links to our road network. One particular plot is TR002 which I believe to be far more suitable for a residential development, particularly due to the road access, as this would reduce the need for any additional traffic to come through the village as access could be made directly from the A50 via the A521. I am also particularly annoyed at the fact that the	wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						original consultation, where the area was apparently given preferential status, was done without any residents knowledge, and we were unable to voice our objections at this initial stage. I would therefore appreciate this proposal being looked at again, and the above points taken into account before a final decision is made.	
PO1475	Mr T Brian				Object	Please accept this letter of my comments and objections to the proposed housing development in Forsbrook, particularly BB041 and the travellers camp TR002 The field is green belt and should remain so as it has onto been proven that more housing is needed in forsbrook, which at this time is a village To develop on green belt requires exceptional circumstances. I don't believe this is the case. None of the residents in Manifold Road, Trent Road, Dove Road, Hillside Avenue in the immediate vicinity of BB041 have been notified by any communication from SMDC or its planning department. This could have been In the form of flyers, newsletters, trade locally magazines etc. There has been no postal communication of the intended proposal. It may have been decided that more housing is required in SMDC, but given the size of the area there are certainly more suitable locations than BB041. All properties in Manifold Road which back on to BB041 will be devalued as they will lose the privacy and views from there back garden. It could put some of our younger and most recent residents in Manifold Road at significant risks of negative equity. Trading for health house and garden centre and Foxfield railway could be significantly reduced as its present visitors have a perception of being in the countryside, which in fact are green belt. Due to the location of forsbrook and the fact that it is a village with Ltd amenities and most families with younger children find necessary to own and run 2 cars. More new housing will create more traffic problems. At present the section Caverswall Old Road which was affected is actually a country lane with passing places.	• See response to PO9945 regarding green belt • See response to PO9109 regarding consultation • See response to PO154 regarding property values and loss of views and residential amenity • See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9448 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to question 40 regarding the travellers site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						This section of road has a national speed limit. Roads used to access this area are country lanes. During school opening times these roads are at present extremely busy. Winter months create more problems using them, Snow ploughs and gritter's would be needed more frequently. That said these roads are part of our area and are wholly acceptable to the current residents my side of forsbroom. To develop them would completely change the area of this countryside. Creating a new junction at Caverswall Old Road will require major development of this roadway. More houses on Caverswall Road area will create even more delays for the vehicles traversing and joining the A50 at blythe bridge railway crossing. The 2 regular trains each hour 7 days a week already cause chaos. Roads are not too good whichever direction you go in plus they are prone to local flooding.	
PO9160	Mr Joseph Rickard				Object	Please may I give my objections to the building of houses on the plot of green land at the top of Churnet Road Forsbrook. This objection is late because I have been out of the Country. I am a long standing resident of Churnet Road. The plot in question is well kept grassland with mature trees with a long standing public footpath running across it. This gives a pleasing and aesthetic value that to the locale of Caverswall Old Road, Trent Road, Churnet Road and Hillside Avenue. It provides the only readily available recreational space for residents and children. The school grounds are nearby but they are not for public use. To remove the public footpath and uproot trees and the grassed area to build houses will deprive local residents of the free open space that has been used over many years. To do so could be in breach of their Human Rights. Some years ago palisade fencing was erected around this area by some person who no doubt was after taking the land for personal use. However the local council stepped in and quite rightly saved it. So why is the council now suddenly proposing to make a 'U' turn to try and do the same? There are other	• See response to PO9631 regarding landscape • See response to PO9154 regarding recreation use of site • See response to PO182 regarding the need for site allocations on greenfield sites • See response to PO1354 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						'brown sites' that could be developed in a sensitive way. Why not explore this option instead of destroying our quality of life by taking away this small open space by cramming in more dwellings. Building of houses on this small plot will increase what is already a congested area. The narrow roads will not be able to support additional residential traffic and parking that is also used by parents when bringing their children to and from a large school complex.	
PO1380	Mr John Dougherty				Object	Proposed development of land for housing site BB041 (land adjacent to Caverswall old road Blythe Bridge) I want to object strongly to the development of this green belt site for housing. Your records will show that I have objected previously to the proposed development of this at these sites BB063, BB086, BB027/28, BB040. My objections against the development of these sites apply equally to site BB041. Hence to avoid repetition I would be grateful if you could apply my previous objections.	See response to PO9945 regarding green belt
PO312	J Gillman					Regarding BB041. There are several objections to the dept. of this site. There are already problems with flooding given the lie of the land. Further housing will reduce natural drainage given increased hard surfaces. There are already at least three permanent water holes at the lower end of the field in question. There are in addition at least four established trees which have a protection order placed on them and which will make it impossible to widen Caverswall Old Road and therefore create an even greater bottleneck as increased traffic will have to negotiate a way round tight bends where visibility for both motorists and pedestrians will constitute a greater danger to all concerned. Two badger setts exist on the proposed site which are protected. Traffic is already a major problem at the junctions of Caverswall Rd, Caverswall Old Road and Uttoxeter Road. Increased traffic will lead to further congestion especially as trains cross at the level crossing every 30	- See response to PO 638 regarding flooding - See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife - See response to PO9154 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						minutes. In addition pedestrians have no adequate footpaths down Caverswall Rd and Caverswall Old Road. Without significant widening of roads and pavements the risk to life and limb can only increase.	
PO1347	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Site BB041 has not been covered by the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys. MAGIC http://www.magic.gov.uk shows the two north-western fields within this site to be 'Good quality semi-improved grassland'. The entire site is in a Higher Level Stewardship scheme, indicating that habitat quality and diversity could be higher than on average farmland. From aerial photos and photos sent to us by residents, all the fields within the site look to be potentially diverse, or at least not intensively managed. From aerial photos and Google Streetview, the hedgerows look to be potentially diverse, with good structure and contain mature trees. There are two ponds on the site, which could potentially support great crested newts and other amphibians such as Common Toad (priority species). A number of birds have been recorded in the area including priority species Dunnock, Bullfinch, good populations of House sparrow and Skylark. The site could potentially be of high environmental value and needs to be assessed against the Staffordshire LWS criteria.	Comments noted the Council is undertaking a further ecological assessment of the site the results of which will inform the decision regarding the suitability of the site for allocation
PO9509	Mr Chris Stevenson				Object	Summary of full representation (attached) Primary reasons for objection are: BB041 is currently designated as greenbelt land and therefore unsuitable for a development of this scale. It is a massive and very obtrusive development. BB041 would impact on the landscape setting of the area. There are no pavements for pedestrians. All road junctions in the vicinity of BB041 are very narrow. Caverswall Road could not accommodate the traffic generated. The road junction between Caverswall Road and Uttoxeter Road is dangerous to all users. BB041 would be detrimental to the rural character and quality of the area. Visual and acoustic privacy of existing	- See response to PO9945 regarding green belt - See response to PO9631 regarding landscape - See response to PO1354 regarding highways - See response to PO876 regarding scale of development

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						immediate residents will be decimated. Proposal contradicts previous statements made by SMDC on the protection of the green belt.	
PO351	Mr Stuart and Norma Rushton				Object	The proposed housing development off Willfield Lane has a number of issues that make the site unsuitable for housing development. Willfield Lane is narrow and at peak periods it is hazardous, more traffic will make this problem worse. Visibility from Fairfield Avenue and Meadow Road is impaired when cars and larger vehicles are parked on Willfield Lane. Extra traffic will make the situation more dangerous. Residents have to use their own transport as the bus service has been cut. In bad weather the existing drains and sewers in Brown Edge are unable to cope with the present number of houses. Further housing will make the problem worse. The residents of Brown Edge have to wait for two weeks to get a doctor's appointment. More residents will mean longer waiting time. We are fortunate to enjoy abundant wildlife, foxes, bats, pole-cats, badgers and many types of birds. These creatures will lose their habitats if building work goes forward. We live in a beautiful village, its character will be lost with more housing, please do not allow this to happen.	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife
PO1387	Mrs Patricia Powell				Object	The site is bounded by narrow lanes which make driving more challenging especially as pavements are virtually non-existent. I believe several trees edging the lanes are subject to its preservation order so widening the roads to allow for extra traffic will be problematic. To provide access to this site will only increase to congestion leading to further delays especially when joining Uttoxeter Road where the level crossing provides an effective barrier to free moving traffic approximately every 30 minutes. We have regular visits from the badgers that have setts in the fields which will be destroyed by this proposed development. Flooding is an increasing problem and further building with consequent reduction of natural grass and soil surfaces will serve to make flooding	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO638 regarding flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						more likely	
PO1391	Ms Brenda Hewitt				Object	This is an extension of the boundary and land is green belt designated. The proposed building of 70 houses will impact on the local roads which do not cater for the existing traffic. Congestion has been observed and documented by the Parish Council at the junction of the Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road and Uttoxeter Rad where the railway crossing is would cause. Pavements are inadequate and nonexistence in places on Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road. A new housing system would cause chaos on the narrow road system. Noise pollution would increase. Lighting will disrupt bats flight paths. Animal life will be affected and bird's life with feeding areas developed. Schools will not able to cope with the no of children. Dr's surgeries are full to capacity. The village cannot sustain more houses and vehicles which with the proposed 70 houses could be more than 140 cars. I strongly object to this proposed housing site.	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9448 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO9142 regarding pollution
PO1064	Mr David Nixon				Object	This new site has all the shortcomings of the previous sites with regard to infrastructure and flood risk. It has access only from Caverswall Old Road and all traffic would be concentrated on this. It slopes towards the Uttoxeter/ Blythe Bridge station junction which has been highlighted as an are subject to flooding. In contrast there are immediately to the East has two long road frontages and 5 connections to the road network. These would facilitate a diffusion rather than concentration of traffic. There is also scope here for the integration of a SuDS framework to attenuate surface water flows. This directly responds to the Environment Agency policy in "site assessment,key issues" This alternative site has shorter easier transport links to Forsbrook, particularly for pedestrians which has relevance for the affordable housing component. Most importantly this site would be sustainable and deliverable within the plan period, characteristics	• See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to PO9448 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						which are not obviously apparent for the other sites	
PO1268	Mr G Hulme				Object	To many houses already and do not want a traveller site on my doorstep	Objection noted
PO1242	Mr J Millar				Object	Traffic is already extremely heavy on this road especially due to the fact the road is very narrow. Also, there is no public pavement for pedestrians which could result in accidents. Further traffic volumes will be dangerous Ref – TR002 the area is already overcrowded with traffic congestion compounding the problem	See response to PO1354 regarding highways
PO1285	Mr and Mrs A Powell				Object	village plan ie site around the village breach road for playing field + building these are my preferred options. NO BUILDING ON GREEN FIELD SITE	Objection noted
PO8980	Mr and Mrs John David and Susan Margaret Jackson				Object	We also consider that as there is already a development at Cresswell that has been approved for in excess of 160 homes and planned development to the extension of the business park there is no room for any further development to put added strain on the schools in Blythe Bridge, Tean and surrounding areas. Indeed the Primary school at Draycott is no longer there. There are no schools or any nearby services for the expansion of Cresswell so the already stretched services in Blythe Bridge will be expected to pull in the slack. This takes us on to the proposed housing sites BB041 /ADD011 and BB054 in Forsbrook/ Caverswall Road and Draycott Old Road. These sites are in the green belt and should not be used except in the most extreme circumstances. Furthermore Draycott Old Road just can't take the extra volume of traffic that a development such as this will generate. As for the area of green belt BB041 the road leading to that is the Same in as much as it's a single track for the most part. Our green belt is precious and must be preserved for future generations and not chipped away at until we have nothing left. We are most fortunate to live in a pretty rural area and it will be a sad day indeed when it's all gone. The junction in the centre of the village is already overcrowded and traffic is held up constantly with lorries etc. making their	- See response to PO182 regarding the need for site allocations - See response PO9448 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO9945 regarding the green belt - See response to PO1354 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						deliveries to Tesco express and the Co-op in Blythe Bridge, which usually coincides with the school run.	
PO9478	Mr and Mrs Moore				Object	We are writing to vehemently object to the proposed allocation of land off Caverswall Old Road, Forbrook for housing development. Firstly, having lived in Manifold Road for 22 years we are fully aware of the present difficulties re volume of traffic at the junctions of Uttoxeter Road/Cheadle Road and the junction by Blythe Bridge railway station where Caverswall Road meets Uttoxeter Road, particularly in the mornings and evenings. An additional 70 houses will only add to the chaos and create huge traffic delays for local people. The lane itself off which the housing development is proposed is exactly that - a country lane - and is dangerous at the best of times. There are no pavements and vision is very limited meaning that cars have to continually stop to allow each other to pass. At drop off time for Blythe Bridge High School the traffic coming to and from both directions is horrendous. Adding to this would just exacerbate an already dangerous situation. Proposals to widen the road would not offer a solution as the bottlenecks at both ends of the lane would still exist. Secondly, we wish to object in the strongest terms against any development that would disturb the rich ecology of the area. This land is inhabited by a real diversity of wildlife and it would be a travesty if the habitats of these animals, plants and trees were to be destroyed. If you actually took the time to walk along the lane, you would see established trees and hedgerows that house a huge number of animals that makes our village - as it stands - a pleasure to live in. Thirdly, we would like to ask if anyone has considered the issue of drains that, in times of heavy rain are unable to cope with volume of water in the area around the approach to Blythe Bridge railway station from Caverswall Road which is like a river with water pouring up out of the drains. While we understand that a	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to question 40 regarding the traveller site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Parish plan has had to be put forward there is a clear alternative for housing development in the area that would have no detrimental impact on roads, drains or wildlife. This is the land (jackson's Yard) formerly proposed as a traveller site, which has direct access to the A50 and would have minimal impact on the green belt. We understand that the current owners would sell this land as long as it was used for housing not travellers. Local feelings are running very high and confidence in the SMDC is very low considering the way in which this whole issue has been handled. We have never been informed directly by either SMDC or the Parish Council regarding this issue and have relied on neighbours and homemade fliers to bring it to our attention. I hope that trust in those whom we expect to protect our interests will be rebuilt and our views listened to and respected.	
PO1381	Mr Philip S Price				Object	Proposed development of land for housing site BB041 (land adjacent to Caverswall old road Blythe Bridge) I want to object strongly to the development of this green belt site for housing. Your records will show that I have objected previously to the proposed development of this at these sites BB063, BB086, BB027/28, BB040. My objections against the development of these sites apply equally to site BB041. Hence to avoid repetition I would be grateful if you could apply my previous objections.	See response to PO182 regarding green belt and the need for site allocations
PO9471	Mr and Mrs Canner				Object	We wish to object to the planning of house building on the above plot BB041. Our concerns as residents of Caverswall Road are as follows: 1 This land is greenbelt land – there is a vast amount of brown belt land available throughout Staffordshire which would be improved vastly if housing was built, but green belt land should be cherished as it provides enjoyable areas for wildlife, walkers, dog owners etc. to enjoy. 2 The area indicated would create considerable access issues. Currently Caverswall Old Road is a complete bottle neck at rush hour periods as it is only one	- See response to PO182 and PO9945 regarding green belt and the need for site allocations - See response to PO1354 regarding highways - See response to PO638 regarding flooding - See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife - See response to PO9631 regarding landscape impact

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						car wide with occasional passing places. The junction with Caverswall Road has visibility and width issues causing further problems. 3 There are no pavements in either Caverswall Road, or Caverswall Old Road which endangers the lives of pedestrians and drivers. 4 The lanes surrounding this area are small, narrow country lanes and the increased vehicular and pedestrian movements would be a major cause for concern increasing the risk of accidents. 5. The country lanes are prone to flooding cutting off access... most recently on March 28th 2016 when Caverswall Road was flooded and blocked by stranded vehicles in two places... at the bottom of Caverswall Road immediately after turning from the railway lines and also further up the lane where a second stranded vehicle blocked the lane. This caused major traffic issues and difficulties for drivers having to turn around in tiny country lanes. The other major concern was that the traffic was backing up onto Uttoxeter Road and across the railway lines... and this is a regular occurrence. This is so dangerous and Network Rail must also have concerns. 6 The land being considered is also home to badger setts and lots of other wildlife, this habitat should be secured on ecological grounds. Badgers visit my garden so I know that they have setts in the adjacent fields. 7 The proposed housing would be a blot on the countryside landscape eating into what little remaining green belt land surrounds us. Horrendous! 8 As a Civil Engineer, and in my opinion, I doubt that the proposed land would be viable for development as the natural fall of the ground would make drainage, both surface water and foul, almost impossible to achieve as the lower end of the land is completely surrounded by private housing. The housing is mature individually built detached properties, not of the "estate" type where you would expect mains drainage to have been laid to cope for future development. Please consider	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						my objections and the future of a corner of local countryside that may be lost forever.	
PO350	Ms Shirley Hulme				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development of the site in Willfield Lane Brown Edge, numbered BE041. We feel this site is totally unsuitable for this proposed housing development. Our objection is due to its position on a very narrow country lane and the increased number of vehicle journeys it will generate in an area that already has a propensity for road traffic accidents. The lane in question connects the Brown Edge area with Stockton Brook and the A53. In places this road is only wide enough for one vehicle to travel along at a time and, as a consequence of this, peak period usage is already treacherous. The possibility of a further 80 cars plus using the lane will only further aggravate this already hazardous situation. We are also of the opinion that Fairfield Avenue will become a short cut for these additional vehicles wishing to access the A53 for journeys to Leek and beyond. Fairfield Avenue already has many cars and, indeed, larger vehicles parked outside its homes and the additional flow of traffic will make it a dangerous area for all concerned. Those who will use the exit of Willfield Lane onto High Lane will find that they already have very bad visibility in the easterly direction made all the more dangerous by the volume and speed of the traffic using this major arterial road. It is a dangerous and stressful manoeuvre which, again, is not going to be helped by an increase in the usage which BE041 being developed will create. At the present time the change in weather patterns causing torrential downpours of rain is a problem for residents to the west of Willfield Lane due to the antiquated drainage system not being able to cope with the huge amounts of surface water. Flooding has been reported in the houses in Meadow Road and Caroline Crescent with manhole covers being lifted and raw sewage actually coming up in some homes. Increased housing on the Willfield Lane site will	• See response to PO1354 regarding highways • See response to PO638 regarding flooding • See response to PO9448 regarding wildlife • See response to PO9154 regarding residential amenity

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1028 5	Janet Carnall				Object	remove a large amount of natural water runoff exacerbating the problems now being experienced. The narrow lanes to the North of the site are already suffering due to the lack of parking facilities as they are unable to additionally park outside their own homes. They are, therefore, unsuitable for increased use as a thoroughfare and would not be safe or practical as such. Additionally, this site is one of abundant wildlife which gives great pleasure to those people who live on its boundaries and who use the field for leisure activities. There are bats, badgers, foxes, deer and a myriad number of breeds of birds that will lose their habitat. This will greatly decrease the standard of life for residents. We in Fairfield Avenue and Willfield Lane do not want to be overlooked by houses built in this area. The terrain of BE041 is higher than our homes and we do not want to lose our privacy and the peace and quiet we currently enjoy. The increase in traffic is also unwanted by all concerned and we are most unhappy that our life and the area we love will be blighted by this proposed development. We look forward to receiving your written response in respect of the above issues as a matter of urgency. Access to this site is to narrow country lane of Caverswall old road, which is in several places single car width with making shift passing places. There are no foot paths or curbs or street lighting for pedestrians to walk along this lane cautiously to reach Forsbrook village and sightedness are poor. Generation or more traffic (100+ cars/vehicles) would cause problems and increase in noise. Where this road meets Caverswall Road at a T Junction, the width is restricted to one car and sight lines are also poor. Flooding infrastructure highways cost viability Flooding of Caverswall road where it meets Uttoxeter Road to create a T junction is and always has been a major problem. It is impassable, happening	See response to PO1354 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						regularly and forcing the residents to divert into Blythe Bridge village through Forsbrook back along Caverswall Road, passed this proposed housing site generating more traffic problems. The sewage/drainage systems on the road is already overwhelmed with the slightest rainfall running off the fields from top junction with Caverswall Old Road, manhole covers are raised with the force of the water and sewage spills onto road and sidewalk making it a health and safety issue for existing residents, pedestrians and local school children. Development of site BB041 will only exacerbate further. Major Investment of SMDC /Highways/Seven Trent is much needed to improve the road system and indeed the road surface as it is in a very sad state at the moment. To add to this, there is also the dangerous highways problems which have arisen from Blythe Bridge Railway who do not use the carpark instead they park up the length of Caverswall Road for the whole day, causing greatly reduced road with in the road creating a bottleneck system with substantial tailbacks of traffic even queuing onto the rail crossing itself. Landscape – Inappropriate development – the proposal concerned is a change of use of land and would adversely affect the character and opens of this area by extending the boundary. Residents only wish to protect this semi-rural environment.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9680	Brenda Matthews				Support	(Summarised) Support the Council's proposals for the housing development that would be situated less than 100m from the opposite end of our field. We currently live in Weston Coyney but would love to have the opportunity to live in Fosbrook on our land and be part of the growing developments in the surrounding areas.	Support noted
PO781	Dr Jules Alt				Object	1) Due process in current consultation not followed - this site was not appropriately publically highlighted during the consultation period. The official SMDC sign was put up in the afternoon of 3 May, but removed by someone on the same day. We telephoned the appropriate department of SMDC who promised replace the poster, but it has still not been replaced, less than 24 hours before the consultation period is due to end. This will have adversely impacted on the number of comments made about this site. 2) Loss of amenity. There is a public right of way across the site, in almost constant use by the public for walking / dog walking allowing enjoyment of the countryside. Development of the site with 70 properties would significantly increase traffic noise on Draycott Old Road and spoil the tranquil nature of the lane 3) Loss of amenity - privacy. Part of the site is raised above road level and properties developed on this part of the site be above and would overlook the current properties on the lane. 4) Flooding. During even modest rainfall, a significant amount of water flows down the lane past BB054. Concreting over this large soakaway fielded area, which drains into the River Blythe that passes around the boundary of BB054 has the potential to increase this flood water. There are a number of well known recent flooding incidents of Forsbrook village which would have been worsened by this. 5) Road safety for pedestrians. There is no pavement from BB054 into Forsbrook village, and the lane is too narrow to allow addition of a pavement past existing properties. 70 residences would include a large number of school-aged children amongst the residents who should be walking to school. Lack of a safe walking route to school would encourage car usage and hence traffic and contribute to a growing childhood obesity problem. 6) Road safety for motor vehicles. Because of the curve in Cheadle Road opposite The Butchers Arms, at the junction between Draycott Old Road and Cheadle Road (at the village end of the lane) it is almost impossible to see oncoming traffic from the Cheadle direction. 7) Road safety for vehicles and pedestrians exiting the development / on Draycott Old Road. The lane is only single track in most places, and has a bend at BB054. I find it difficult to see where there could be safe access to the site both during development and following occupation. 8) Excessive scale of development for a small country lane 9) Development of the site would entail loss of natural habitat to wildlife, including hedgerows and trees. 10) Lack of infrastructure locally for increased number of residents, lack of bus transport, schooling, policing, primary care facilities and general road congestion.	- The consultation was widely publicised and included a flyer being sent to all households and businesses in the District through Royal Mail. High levels of responses have been received by the Council from residents which suggests that a significant number of residents knew about the consultation. The Council cannot be held responsible for the removal of site notices by third parties. - Public footpaths can be maintained or redirected - Issues such as overlooking, traffic generated will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application - The Environment Agency have not raised any issues with this site. SCC as Lead Local Flood Authority state that part of the site is within a floodplain. They do not object to the site subject to a condition requiring early engagement with the Environment Agency and a flood risk assessment - Highways Authority advises that access at the eastern end of the site looks possible as levels are less of an issue than from the west. Adjacent to the site Draycott Old Road is only single vehicle width in places and has no footway provision. - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy - Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area, consideration will be given to the scale of development and its impact on the surrounding area. - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact of proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site was mainly species poor improved grassland grazed by cows with 2 trees with bat potential.
PO88	Mr Barry Cartlidge				Object	According to the proposed site for a housing development I realise that the land proposed for this site is situated between Uttoxeter Road, Draycott and Draycott Old Road , Forsbrook. My concern is the access to this site – I presume that access would be virtually impossible to and from Uttoxeter Road due to the distance from that road . Therefore I am again assuming that access would have to be via Draycott Old Road which even at the present time is not suitable for the traffic that it carries. This road is used generally as a short cut for traffic wishing to avoid the heavily congested area around Blythe Bridge village. It is impossible to get two vehicles passing side by side without extreme care and in some places along the road only one vehicle can travel at a time. We are therefore having a further 70 houses built and probably a minimum of a further 140 vehicles travelling in the area. Having lived in Forsbrook for the past 35 years I have seen a gradual increase in the number of vehicles using the roads in the area. Travelling from Forsbrook towards Blythe Bridge , even at the quiet times of the day you have to queue for some time to get on to Uttoxeter Road at the junction of Cheadle Road. The junction cannot cope with the volume as it presently stands today so a further increase in that volume would have a knock on effect from Draycott Old Road, Cheadle Road and into Blythe Bridge. Traffic turning right from Draycott Old Road towards Cheadle would be doing so at their own risk as it is impossible to see any distance prior to making the 2lderly2u. I would suggest that the planning committee travel along Draycott Old Road into Forsbrook before making any recommendations. On conclusion I feel that the whole road 2infrastructure should be investigated prior to any consideration for the further additional housing . Safety to all road users is paramount and after having a pedestrian crossing application refused in Forsbrook I feel that safety is being jeopardised , especially for school children and the 2lderly wishing to cross this already dangerous road.	• See response to PO781 regarding access
PO1355	Mr R Goodall				Object	BB041 (50 Housing development. Caverswall Old Road) is a late addition to the local plan. Consequently giving local residents less time to be aware of the proposed green belt site. And your	• See response to PO781 regarding infrastructure and highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						proposal of 50 houses. The two proposed/preferred question as above as well as Draycott Old Road 70 new build are to be taken into the greenbelt and not infilling. I question their sustainable viability because of your core strategy criteria with regard to infrastructure. Your two preferred options will create a lot of pressure to the Cheadle Road to Blythe Bridge– 70 new builds) with both sites being either side of that same road, and are both only a short distance from the Junction of Caverswall old road. Caverswall old road/draycott old road are traditional rural roads with narrow widths and the sites will have an impact for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, disabled. Will two new sites provide enough green space to meet environmental /community leisure expectations? In the Forsbrook conurbation once both sites are complete?	
PO9946	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Object	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: Our comments relate to the absence of evidence presented by the Council to justify the need for Green Belt release, in the context of there being alternative land i.e. Blythe Vale, available for development, but not assessed by the Council. Site BB054 is identified for release from the Green Belt for housing, however given the proximity of the River Blythe and the nature of the constrained points of highways access, onto a narrow country lane, we question the appropriateness of this allocated site, compared to the availability, suitability and achievability of Blythe Vale. In summary, we believe that additional housing sites should be identified at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook but also that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for BB054 and BB041. BB054 in particular appears to have additional technical constraints that have yet to be explored.	The Green Belt review considered the overall impact on Green Belt purposes of the development to be limited. It recommended the site was considered for release only in context of wider land in this location It stated that the site was “<i>Not physically well enclosed (being hedgerows on three sites) but reasonably visually well enclosed from Draycott Old Road. Development would create an incongruous eastward extension, leaving an illogical tongue of Green Belt to the west. See also wider land to the south of Draycott Old Road/East of Tater Lane for a more comprehensive masterplanned approach to this area.</i>”
PO1390	Mr Roger Melville				Object	Firstly this is open grassland with no defensible boundaries on three sides leaving room for future village sprawl. I am aware green belt land must be used in order to accommodate future housing needs but still there must be sites within this area that would give less impact on the Green Belt if developed. Secondly Draycott old road is a narrow carriageway, most of the length one car width. It is as used as a rat run to the A50 commuters and parents on the school run. It frequently floods following this excessive rainfall and has no footways on either side. More cars using the road following this housing development would make this road extremely dangerous. I cannot believe Highways have passed this. I feel these concerns are valid planning reasons for this site to be removed as a preferred option.	See response to PO9946 regarding the Green Belt and PO781 regarding highways
PO260	Mrs S Allt				Object	Housing increase within Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge to the level suggested will put extra pressures on local schools there will not be enough school places for the large increase in residents. Roads within these two villages already struggle with the amount of traffic from residents and those passing through particularly at peak times the increased housing will have significant impact on these roads	See response to PO781 regarding infrastructure, highways, flooding, recreation use and public consultation

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						many of which are country lanes. Local services are quite limited within these villages and we no longer have a local police station. What do the council intend on doing to address these concerns prior to increasing Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge village occupants to the proposed level? BB054 Draycott Old road access from top end of lane is acceptable however this quickly turns into a single track lane, there are no street lamps down and no pavements down this lane, it is also currently a 60mph road with a number of blind bends and it is poorly surfaced all these issues would need rectifying before you could safely add 70 houses with anything from 50-140 cars to go with them! At the end of Draycott Old Road where it connects with Cheadle Road is a blind corner and the potential for increased accidents must also be considered. Drainage on this lane is poor and there have been a number of issues resulting in flooding directly from the lane within forsbrook village - removing the land/trees etc and adding houses would have a significant impact on current poor drainage issues. Can the council assure villagers that building on this site would not increase the risk of flooding as previously seen within the village? This is currently greenbelt land with a public footpath and is particularly popular with dog walkers and families as it leads to the recreation ground in Blythe Bridge 70 houses on this site would take that away from people affecting leisure/pleasure activities other than unpaved country lanes or paved road side where do the council propose that these people can now walk for pleasure? Scale of this development for such a small area seems ridiculous is this really necessary and the best possible site given the above issues. Forsbrook Parish Council have rejected sites BB27/28 and BB040 however it is very difficult to see why they would feel that Draycott Old Road with very similar structure is a suitable alternative. Low numbers of local residents seem to be aware of this proposed development on the lane - the SMDC yellow proposal notice at the end of the public footpath was removed the day it was put up, we do not know by whom. I alerted the Parish council and SMDC of this SMDC advised me that it would be replaced. It has not been replaced. How can local residents voice their comments if they are unaware of the proposed plans surely this contravenes local consultation.	
PO10263	Mrs Christine Bratt				Object	I am making observations concerning the proposal to include additional housing in Forsbrook; 1. off Caverwall Old Road - this road is a narrow county lane with no public footpath and is liable to flooding. The local school is full to capacity so it would mean more use of transport to get to other local schools not in walking distance. The traffic situation in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge can at best be described as a disaster and when as often happens the A50 is closed it is an absolute nightmare. To suggest an increase in residents is irresponsible. On the grounds of health and safety we should not be encouraging walkers along a road with no footpaths	See response to PO 781 regarding highways and infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						and insufficient room to provide them. 2. Draycott Old Road - again another country road that would only bring more traffic causing further problems and creating a great health and safety risk. The comments as detailed above also apply. In addition there would need to be major improvement to the drains both rainwater and sewage to cope with the additional burden, as well as increase in health facilities and doctors surgeries.	
PO37	Mr Daniel Newton				Object	I am objecting to the proposed site off Draycott Old Road for the following reasons: 1. The site proposed would be better suited to a brown field site or waste land, not a working farm on green belt; 2. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the amenities of existing residents (doctors, library's, schools etc); 3. The development would be accessed via a dangerous single track road, generating traffic levels posing a threat to highway safety; 4. Inadequate space for additional pupils at local schools; 5. The destruction on local nature; 6. Would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area; 7. Impact of construction and construction vehicles would cause danger to the public on such a narrow access road; 8. Impact of construction would also cause unacceptable disturbance to local residents.	• See response to PO781 regarding the need for greenfield site allocation, infrastructure, highways, wildlife • Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan which seek to protect the character of the area • Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations
PO104	Mrs Shontell Tunnicliffe				Object	I am opposed the development of this areas as I am a resident and there is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate such development. The scale of this site would dominate the local area and this is a small area. The wildlife would be affected severely and this is unfair as I believe this is in inappropriate development and is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. The fields and trees are a haven for numerous British wildlife this includes a large variety of bird species including owls, woodpeckers, kestrel, sparrow hawk and buzzard. The fields are also home to hedgehogs which are in serious decline and their habitat should be protected. Foxes, badgers and pheasants are regularly seen in the field. There are numerous bats which live in the surrounding area and they are seen every evening by the residents. This is a foraging /commuting area for the bats and therefore should not be disturbed, as bats are a protected species. Heavy traffic on the A521 Uttoxeter Road which is currently very dangerous and should actually have speed cameras as it is like race track. Bringing more traffic to contribute to this as well as the traffic getting in and out of Blythe Bridge on a daily basis is just madness. The commute to get from Blythe Bridge/Draycott, to even Longton at 7am in the morning can queue from the Blythe Bridge turn off that then has knock on effect. The A50 from Blythe that links to the Uttoxeter turning is an extremely busy and dangerous junction and this alone without the consideration on the wildlife should be considered highly as it is very dangerous. I am a resident on the lane and do not personally want the landscape altered for any kind of employment as we already have enough sheds and office buildings	• See response to PO781 regarding infrastructure, scale of development, wildlife, highways • Loss of views is not a material planning consideration • The Landscape, Local Green Space & Heritage Impact Study acknowledged that the site had a high landscape sensitivity and any development will have to take account of the impact on the wider landscape to ensure it does not have a harmful impact

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						across Stoke and Staffordshire that can surely accommodate. Access roads for the from the A521, Uttoxeter Road, have significant issues as there is one road in and out as the train line cause chaos at the busier periods. This results in very dangerous road conditions. Several accidents and near misses have occurred due to the current volume of traffic. The situation at these junctions is exacerbated twice daily by school traffic. If the proposed development were to go ahead it would cause a significant health and safety risk to other car users due to the volume of traffic and the increase to this also the main of Blythe Bridge would be used as a rat run to avoid the tailbacks. Rural Vista / Loss of Light: The proposed development will have a severe impact on views across open countryside, as it will be visible from Uttoxeter Road, the Blythe Estate and of course the residents. Further development will result in the skyline being breached, development of this site has been discussed in the past and refused for development with Modwen wanting to change the plans. At the time Rob Ffello MP was involved and I will be making him aware of the above as the proposals then were dangerous, and still are. In the past few months he has called to the Government to build a relief road for Stoke-On-Trent as realistically the A50 is reaching the limit of what can be achieved with a road that has limited space for expansion and simply cannot handle the volume of traffic required of it. The city is in constant gridlock. By developing further is ludicrous the A50 nor A500 is suitable and all of this links to Blythe and you want to add more to this by building more. I appreciate the need to develop but it is the wrong area with insufficient infrastructure with no consideration given to the residents in the local areas.	
PO434	Mrs Gillian Jackson				Object	I have grave concerns regarding the proposed development of this site the main one being the amount of extra vehicles using Draycott Old Road. This road is single track with a few passing places and NO footpath. It is already used as a rat run for traffic avoiding an almost always congested Blythe Bridge. I would be interested to know when a traffic survey was last carried out on this road and at what time of day etc. Between 7am and 8.30am and 3pm to 5.30pm traffic can be heavy especially during term time in schools.	• See response to PO781 regarding highways
PO1443	Mrs S J Malpass				Object	I refer to the preferred options sites - development boundaries consultation and the housing requirement for Blythe Bridge. In particular I refer to your recent preferred options for 50 and 70 No new house sites, viz caverswall Old Road (BB041) and Draycott Old Road respectively, to fulfil proposed 120 No new homes allocated for the next 15 year development plan. I consider the impact of these two close new build sites will contribute to an over populated area around Forsbrook, and they will contravene your core strategy policy which is to ensure current infrastructure is not compromised. Both your preferred, proposed sites are in such close proximity to	• See response to PO781 regarding infrastructure, highways and need for site allocations

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						one another it raises the question how the foreseeable impact on Forsbrook, with inevitable heavy traffic flow through the road network of Forsbrook/Cheadle/Blythe Bridge, plus surrounding road links, will cope as these developments mature. There would also be probable, substantial pressure on other necessary infrastructure amenities in Forsbrook because of your proposed concentrated preferred options, as a random example - pedestrian/leisure requirements, utility services, deliveries (expected on-line traffic that would be required to service everyday expectations of 21st century residents to 120 no homes). A more proportionate, fairer and transparent 'spread' of new housing in Blythe Bridge could still provide more community leisure facilities instead of saturating a 15 year allocation in two close proximity clustered sites. Over a 15 year period I would have expected a fairer distribution of preferred sites, with possibilities for mid to long term land bank, and I am quite frankly bewildered by your preferred, proposed sites for the next development plan. Once again I object to 70 no new build in Draycott Old Road and 50 no new build in Caverswall Old Road (BB041) for the aforementioned reasons.	
PO997	Ms Natasha Allt				Object	I use the footpath on this field to get to Blythe Bridge, and also walk my nanny's dog on this field. I also use it for running on. I would be sad to lose this lovely green area, and think the council should be supporting people to keep fit rather than building houses on this field. It would also cause a lot more traffic on Draycott Old Road which is a quiet, peaceful lane and is too narrow for the level of traffic in the proposed development.	• See response to PO781 regarding public footpath and highways
PO1002	Mrs Carol Harrison				Object	I use the public footpath on this site to exercise and walk my dog when visiting my relatives. I enjoy the natural beauty of the field and would be saddened at the loss of this amenity. I also walk down the lane, which is narrow with no pavement, and the increased traffic on the lane would increase the danger of this activity. Children walking to school from this development would have to walk in the road, as it would not be possible to put in a pavement because of existing houses, and that would be a risk so encourage more short car journeys, at a time when the council should be encouraging the young to exercise. Close to this site, at the Forsbrook end of the lane, it is almost impossible to safely turn right towards Cheadle, and increased traffic would worsen this. Turning left is already very congested at peak times, often with traffic backed up all the way into Forsbrook. 80-120 extra cars again can only worsen this. There is also flooding on this lane, and further downhill in the village, and decreasing the soakaway effect of this field can only worsen this.	• See response to PO781 regarding public footpath, flooding and highways
PO9137	Mr and Mrs M Jackson				Object	I would also like to oppose the housing development that you are proposing off Draycott Old Road for the following reasons:- * Having lived in Scarratt Drive with my parents for many years and	• See response to PO781 regarding public footpath and highways • Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						my mother still lives there now I have seen and experienced first hand how busy Draycott Old Road already is, as you are aware it's quite a narrow road which struggles to cope with the amount of traffic that already goes down it. As you are proposing that Draycott Old Road be the main entrance to the housing development, I think it will be quite hazardous and the road will struggle to cope with the amount of traffic, it will also be very disruptive to not only the people that live close by but the increased traffic throughout the village would also become a nuisance to local residents. * The turning leading from Draycott Old Road into Forsbrook is very dangerous it is a blind bend and most people choose to turn left and turn around because it is so dangerous to turn right. Increased traffic on this turning would be so hazardous, I am very surprised that no fatal accidents have already happened on this bend having had a few near misses myself from people that are going over the speed limit on Cheadle Road and coming around the blind bend, you would definitely be increasing the risk of a fatality should you allow the entrance to the housing development to be located on Draycott Old Road. Do you really want this responsibility to fall to you should something happen? * Our village is already very busy and you want to build 'affordable housing' on this plot, I question what sort of people this housing type would attract? We hold our house prices in Forsbrook because people want to buy our houses as it is currently a desirable place to live, if you were to add a load of affordable housing the residents that already live in the village would find it much harder to sell their property as the area wouldn't be as prestigious. It seems to me and my husband and to many of the local residents that you have put no thought into how your proposed plans for both the traveller's site and the housing development will affect the residents of Forsbrook, many of which have lived in the village all of their lives. Your plans are thoughtless and your actions are careless and this all seems as though it's a money making scheme for the council with no thought as to how this will impact the residents.	housing provision to be affordable • See response top question 40 regarding the traveller site
PO9450	Ms Julie Lyons				Object	I would like to take this opportunity to object to any further building in our village, as previously stated in my earlier objection, the services and the infrastructure cannot cope. I have lived in the village for the last 17 years and I feel that the quality of village life has somewhat diminished. Forsbrook has already lost it's identity and has merged with Blythe Bridge, I don't want to end up living in a suburb of Stoke on Trent as I fear that will be the end result for our neighbour Caverswall. I cannot understand why the Council (government) want to cram developments into unsuitable locations, it should be looking for new locations and building the services and infrastructure to match. The site that has been put forward in the village will cause traffic issues on a daily basis. There	• See response to PO781 regarding infrastructure, highways and PO9137 regarding affordable housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						is also a discrepancy as to the amount of houses that Staffs Moorlands requires and the differences between the two schemes that have been published haven't been fully explained to the public. If there are to be houses built will there be a restriction as to sold to local people or will it be as I fear they are sold to anyone, thus causing further problems with future housing. There has already been one large development and several smaller developments built between the two villages in the last ten years, swelling the population even further.	
PO2918	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In Blythe Bridge site BB054 is likely to require improvements to Draycott Old Road.	• Comment noted
PO1275	Mr Yendole	Forward Planning Stafford Borough Council			Support	In terms of the Green Belt releases on the northern side of Blythe Bridge for housing development the Borough Council supports these proposals in the Preferred Options document .	• Support noted
PO9517	J.M. Belcher				Object	In the knowledge of the proposed developments, preferred options to meet your required housing need in Blythe Bridge, these two sites will significantly outweigh the benefits of your core strategy requirements. The closeness of the two sites (BB054 and BB041) will undoubtedly have an enormous impact on roads, traffic and transport as well as noise levels to surrounding environment, due to the large clusters of proposed housing. The roads referred to are already narrow, have no footpaths in places, and lead to junctions that are already with limited visibility and safe access. the schools would possibly cope but the concentration of these two developments has a longer, larger impact to everyday living. The landscape for these numbers of houses will again be affected by lessening natural wildlife and birdlife. In one statement you want to meet sustainability, control of environment issues but consider two heavily numbered housing clusters to be more preferable in meeting your SHLAA, but will surely have a detrimental impact on all sections of the existing community because you have extended your housing needs in two close sites instead of spreading the housing needs (over the next plan period) in a more fair, proportionate, environmentally friendly future for the area. I hope you will consider the above and view your current proposals, in view of the late addition of land BB041 to your Local Plan in a transparent, democratic, fair way.	• See response to PO781 regarding highways, need for site allocations, infrastructure, wildlife
PO9492	Victoria Stephenson				Object	It was with horror that I learned of the above proposal, the negative effects of which would be considerable for the residents of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. Draycott Old Road is completely	• See response to PO781 regarding highways, infrastructure, flooding and public footpath • See response top question 40 regarding the traveller site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						unsuitable for the increased traffic volume which would be generated, the junction onto Cheadle road is difficult to exit with limited visibility, particularly in the Cheadle direction. This road is increasingly dangerous to cross for our children at Forsbrook school and Blythe Bridge High School, and to exacerbate this would put lives at risk. Inevitably the difficulty with the junction would also send more vehicles in the other direction along Draycott Old Road, which would be even more dangerous as this is only a narrow lane with passing places between the top of Tater Lane and Stewart Avenue, completely unfit for higher traffic volume, and highly dangerous for those who currently walk, run or cycle that way. Blythe Bridge has been subject to ongoing development over many years now - with housing being built on the site of the old Smithfield, the bottom of the High School grounds, the site of the old paper shop, opposite Glebe Close, on the site of the former factory by the Black Cock, the site of the White Cock, Off Adamthwaite Drive... Add to this the further traffic and congestion caused by the Tesco shop, and the village has now reached crisis point. To simply drive through Blythe Bridge has become almost impossible at certain times of day. The schools are already oversubscribed. So I would appreciate an explanation as to why further swathes of housing development are being dumped on our villages, whereas from the maps I can see that there are many Staffordshire Moorlands areas which will be subject to no development whatsoever. I take it the quality of life of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook people is worth less than others? That being the case I suppose that the heartbreak and effects to my quality of life personally, will not be taken into account, but I still have to express them. Section 7 of defra's rights of way circular (1/09) state that the effect that a proposed development will have on a right of way must be considered by planning authorities. That planners have a responsibility to our 'green infrastructure'. Yet, of all the sites you considered you have chosen to take away a public footpath field which is a vital part of the lives of many Blythe and Forsbrook people. I myself have been walking these meadows all my life, and my heart will be broken should it be lost forever. This is not a footpath on a map unknown and unused, it is extremely well used and valued on a daily basis. But once my daily walk turns into a walk through a housing estate, following on to a country lane which is now dangerous and impassable for walkers, leading down the side of a travellers' site, something which has been a huge part of my life, that of my parents and of my children, will be gone forever, and much of my happiness with it. Oh and by the way, that land floods.	
PO9537	Mrs Marion Wade				Object	Summary of representation) I wish to lodge my objections to the change in use of this Green Belt, my reasons as follows: Infrastructure - Traffic/transport. This road is used as a short cut	See response to PO781 regarding highways, wildlife, residential amenity and flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						and has a weight limit on it. It is a narrow road and floods at times. The junctions at the end of the road are very dangerous and parked cars affect visibility. There are also problems due to the volume of traffic at peak times of the day. Volume of traffic during construction would block the road. There are no pavements and many people walk and cycle along it. Landscape - development would adversely affect the character and openness of the area. No exceptional circumstances are evident. It would gradually merge with other villages. Nature Conservation - the site accommodates a diversity of wildlife. Changing the habitat and clearing vegetation will have a detrimental impact. Significant habitats along these hedgerows and in the grassland and agricultural pasture which would be greatly disturbed and potentially lost. Scale of Development - development would be intrusive on the landscape and decrease the biodiversity of this Green Belt land. There would be a loss of privacy, increased traffic and noise pollution. Flood risk - this land is notoriously boggy at the bottom of the field and has flooded in the past. Any development would require substantial groundworks.	
PO4853 PO4852	Miss Angela Hulse				Object	The preferred site BB054 for 70 houses potentially 140 cars will be using Draycott Old Road for access. The lane is notorious for annual flooding from the adjoining fields. You cannot safely access the road to Cheadle from Draycott Old Road without risk, due to the blind bend; some driver's drive around the village to turn around and take the Cheadle Road, this perpetual hazard will just be exacerbated by the increased traffic from the increased traffic from Draycott Old Road. Many villagers use this lane for recreational purposes, like horse riding, cycling, pedestrians, and dog walkers. This benefits health and wellbeing to all. This preferred housing site for 70 homes is on a precious area of Green Belt land and once it's gone it will be lost forever. This ignores David Cameron's pledge to protect Green Belt land. At the moment the roads in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge are grid locked at certain times of the day. We already take the traffic for Alton Towers and surrounding JCB traffic and other HGV's. These roads are dangerous to pedestrians and particularly children and the elderly. We haven't even got a couple of safe places to cross in Forsbrook so a development on this site BB041, I believe has not been carried out, as confirmed at the Tean Meeting. This traffic will also add to the congestion in Forsbrook. We cannot see how such large developments in our village can't cope with the accumulative impact that it has on infrastructure. Schools, Dr's, sewage, drainage already working at full capacity. All these concerns are and need to be addressed. Before finalising preferred sites.	See response to PO781 regarding flooding, highways, public footpath and infrastructure and PO9946 regarding the Green Belt
PO4854 PO4855	Mr John Shaw				Object	The preferred site BB054 for 70 houses potentially 140 cars will be using Draycott Old Road for access. The lane is notorious for annual flooding from the adjoining fields. You cannot safely access	See response to PO781 regarding flooding, highways, public footpath and infrastructure and PO9946 regarding the Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						the road to Cheadle from Draycott Old Road without risk, due to the blind bend; some driver's drive around the village to turn around and take the Cheadle Road, this perpetual hazard will just be exacerbated by the increased traffic from the increased traffic from Draycott Old Road. Many villagers use this lane for recreational purposes, like horse riding, cycling, pedestrians, and dog walkers. This benefits health and wellbeing to all. This preferred housing site for 70 homes is on a precious area of Green Belt land and once it's gone it will be lost forever. This ignores David Cameron's pledge to protect Green Belt land. At the moment the roads in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge are grid locked at certain times of the day. We already take the traffic for Alton Towers and surrounding JCB traffic and other HGV's. These roads are dangerous to pedestrians and particularly children and the elderly. We haven't even got a couple of safe places to cross in Forsbrook so a development on this site BB041, I believe has not been carried out, as confirmed at the Tean Meeting. This traffic will also add to the congestion in Forsbrook. We cannot see how such large developments in our village can't cope with the accumulative impact that it has on infrastructure. Schools, Dr's ,sewage, drainage already working at full capacity. All these concerns are and need to be addressed. Before finalising preferred sites.	
PO98	Mr Edward Hulse					The preferred site BB054 for 70 houses, potentially 140 vehicles, will be using Draycott Old Road for access. This is only a single width country lane with limited passing places and no pavement. The lane is notorious for annual flooding from the adjoining fields after heavy rain. You cannot safely access the road to Cheadle from Draycott Old Road without difficulty and risk, due to the blind bend. Some motorists drive into the village to turn around and then take the Cheadle Road. This perpetual hazard will just be exacerbated by the increased traffic from the Draycott Old Road site. Many villagers use this lane for recreation, ie horses, cyclists, pedestrians and dog walkers. This benefits health and wellbeing to all. This preferred housing site for 70 houses is on a precious area of Green Belt land once used will be lost forever. This ignores David Cameron's pledge to protect Green Belt land. At the moment the roads in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge become gridlocked at certain times. We already take the Alton Towers, JCB sites and surrounding industrial sites with HGV's. These roads are dangerous to pedestrians young and old. Forsbrook does not even have a safe place to cross, so a development of this scale is fraught increased problems. The Highways report on site BB0417. I believe has not been carried out, as confirmed at the Tean meeting. This traffic will also add to the congestion through the village. We cannot see how such large developments in our village can cope with the accumulative impact that it has on the infrastructure:- Traffic congestion and safety. Schools and Healthcare. (Doctors) Sewage	See response to PO781 regarding flooding, ,highways, public footpath and infrastructure and PO9946 regarding the Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						and Drainage. (Already at full capacity) All these concerns need to be addressed before finalising preferred sites. Mr E W Hulse. Mrs L M Hulse.	
PO1065	Mr Thomas Allt				Object	The proposed development would be detrimental to the view of the countryside from existing properties. I enjoy walking on the field, and I enjoy watching wildlife on the field. I also enjoy exercising on the lane, but I have to stop running to let cars past. More cars from a development would make it difficult for me to stay fit.	• See response to PO104 regarding views and PO 781 regarding highways, wildlife and public footpaths
PO1106	Mrs L Henney				Object	The site you are choosing for 70 houses and let's face it 140 cars, will be using Draycott Old Rod might be, I add an old roman road' which is a single country road and a single country lane with only a few places to pass + have to go around another route. You cannot access the road to Cheadle - from Draycott old road, without being risk from the blind bend turning right – you have to either go into the village turning left + DOING U turn – either go look into the butchers arms pub windows to see what traffic is coming from the right from Cheadle – many villagers use the this beautiful country lane to walk their dogs – everyday there are horses and riders that use it too- besides lots off walkers use it too. You will be using a precious piece of land that greenbelt land, which also floods + children play in the brook etc. where else will they go and play in the brook etc.! I have seen quite a few hedgehogs there while walking my dog – which is a public right of way. We cannot take any more traffic in Forsbrook we have Alton Towers traffic and many more	• See response to PO781 regarding highways, flooding and public footpaths
PO1394	Ms Brenda Hewitt				Object	This extension of the boundary and land is green belt designated. The proposed building of 70 houses will impact on the local roads which do not cater for existing traffic. Congestion has been Caverswall Road and Uttoxeter Road where the railway crossing is. Pavements and inadequate and non-existent in places on Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road Noise pollution would increase Lighting will disrupt the flight paths of the bats Animal life will be affected and bird life with feeding areas developed Schools will not be able to cope with the number of children Drs Surgeries are full to capacity The village cannot sustain more houses and vehicles which with the proposed 70 houses could be 140 more cars. I strongly object.	• See response to PO9946 regarding Green Belt and PO781 regarding highways, wildlife and infrastructure • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO1016	Mrs Win Allt				Object	This site is on a single track country lane, with poor visibility on the section of lane passing past it. There is frequent free water flowing down the lane past this site, and it is also bordered by the River Blythe, that the field partially drains into. There is a history of flooding further down the hill in the village of Forsbrook. The lane is not wide enough and has too many bends and blind spots to safely allow a significant number of extra vehicles to access this site from Draycott Old Road. There would be loss of amenity to walkers across the footpath even if access was maintained, if paved over it	• See response to PO781 regarding highways, flooding and public footpath

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						would not be as good for psychological and physical welfare as walking across an open field. The field is home to much wildlife, including pheasants, buzzards, sparrowhawk, and bats are all regularly seen flying over the field.	
PO375	Mr Roger Melville				Object	This site is still good Agricultural Land still currently being used for grazing. It is a very open space and has no defensible boundaries on three sides so leaving opportunity for village sprawl. Within the Greenbelt Study carried out for SMDC it says, "Site BB054 (Draycott Old Road) is not physically well enclosed, and would create an incongruous eastward extension of the village, leaving an illogical tongue of Green Belt to the west". It recommends that the land should only be considered for release in the context of wider land at Draycott Old Road/East of Tater Lane. BB044 Chapel St is a better option, not agricultural land and is not used for grazing and has never been used for grazing. Draycott Old Road is very narrow and is only single track for most of its length Highways report says, " Adjacent to the site Draycott Old Road is only single vehicle width in places and has no footway provision". Draycott Old Road a busy road being used for commuting and school traffic as people use it as access to the A50 avoiding Blythe Bridge if not they have to come out on to Cheadle Road which is blind if travelling towards Cheadle and pretty dangerous if turning towards Blythe Bridge. BB044 Chapel Street is a much better option as it is generally wider and most importantly is a no through road with only six dwellings north of the site. I would also like to make reference to a comment made by Highways when a previous application no 2003/0081/OUT was made I quote: "The Local Highway Authority has no objection and in any event the traffic would be less than generated previously by the Boarding Kennels". On the basis of these two sound planning reasons I believe BB054 should be removed as a preferred site and BB044 added and turned green .	• See response to PO781 regarding highways and PO9946 regarding the Green Belt • Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The sites were assessed taking into account the consultation responses and evidence relating to the site. The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses
PO1267	Mr G Hulme				Object	To many houses already and do not want a traveller site on my doorstep	• See response to PO781 regarding the need for site allocations • See response top question 40 regarding the traveller site
PO8979	Mr and Mrs John David and Susan Margaret Jackson				Object	We also consider that as there is already a development at Cresswell that has been approved for in excess of 160 homes and planned development to the extension of the business park there is no room for any further development to put added strain on the schools in Blythe Bridge, Tean and surrounding areas. Indeed the Primary school at Draycott is no longer there. There are no schools or any nearby services for the expansion of Cresswell so the already stretched services in Blythe Bridge will be expected to pull in the slack. This takes us on to the proposed housing sites BB041 /ADD011 and BB054 in Forsbrook/ Caverswall Road and Draycott Old Road. These sites are in the green belt and should not be used except in the most extreme circumstances. Furthermore Draycott Old Road just can't take the extra volume of traffic that a	• See response to PO781 regarding highways, the need for site allocations, infrastructure and PO9946 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						development such as this will generate. As for the area of green belt BB041 the road leading to that is the Same in as much as it's a single track for the most part. Our green belt is precious and must be preserved for future generations and not chipped away at until we have nothing left. We are most fortunate to live in a pretty rural area and it will be a sad day indeed when it's all gone. The junction in the centre of the village is already overcrowded and traffic is held up constantly with lorries etc. making their deliveries to Tesco express and the Co-op in Blythe Bridge, which usually coincides with the school run.	
PO1116	Mrs L Henney				Object	Please we do not want an entrance in Draycott Old Road it will spoil- the ambiance of the old lane – the lovely hedgerow and the lovely village feel we have in this area. Please whoever it matters to please come down and get a feeling we have & you will understand why we strongly don't want these houses in this field or the extra traffic. Please please listen to us all.	See response to PO781 regarding highways and village character

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4848	Mrs S J Malpass				Object	BB028 - Options Site I am a joint owner of land in Blythe Bridge marked by your reference as BB028 in your current new development plan to replace the local plan which allocates sites for housing. I understand that under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study (SHLAA) housing requirements should be reviewed on an annual basis and I wish to confirm that the above area be included for consideration as an ongoing mid-term potential site 6-10 years to 11-15 years to meet further requirements in the Blythe Bridge area. You wrote to me on 17 June 2014 identifying my land for allocated housing and consideration within the next development plan. You asked for my intention as to whether I would be willing to release my land for development. I confirmed at that time my consent for the land to be identified and considered as a suitable area for proportionally extending the conurbation of Blythe Bridge. I believe that this marked area (your ref. BB028) for future housing would not be a detriment to the green belt area and surrounding environment. The land referred to would definitely meet the core strategy requirements re infrastructure (for schools, roads, traffic, transport, landscape (ie offering community leisure space) nature conservation (adjacent woodland to encourage wildlife, bird and insect life) and the diverted River Blythe already proves that any flood risk would be negligible because of your own developments in the same area)). Therefore this site still has a sustainable suitability with all services available as opposed to proposed preferred sites for large numbers of new housing currently being suggested. It is important to note that various properties have access along the lane adjacent to BB028 as well as the use for agricultural rights of way, that legally no one user/resident can own the land because of its historic, continuous, uninterrupted use by all. Again, I would appreciate that you consider the site which you identified for mid to long term development be annually renewed per SHLAA, and I would be pleased to hear from you following your request to me on 17 June 2014 and my co-operation in this matter.	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO1430	Mr Craig Brough				Support	BB027 I support the development of the above proposed site, my reasons for this are that my parents have owned this land for many years in hope that one day that they could build stables and a dwelling for themselves. This never materialised so my parents have tried to use the field	A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						for its original agricultural purpose, but because of nearby neighbours this has been nearly impossible , due to vandalism and fly tipping. The worst instance is when horses that were using the field were let out without permission and no sign of breakages to the perimeter fence. This happened on two separate occasions. I feel because of the sites position it makes it the ideal site for homes because of the nearby amenities. I also feel it will have little to no impact on the surrounding countryside and environment.	the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.. The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO9481	Mr T D Blairs				Object	BB27/BB28 - Site Option 1. The landowners welcome the review of the Greenbelt that has been undertaken by the Council in an attempt to ensure that future housing requirements of the area are satisfied. Having established that the Greenbelt is impacting upon the Council's ability to satisfy housing need, the landowners consider that the subject site, with an area of just over 2 hectares is better placed to provide a more balanced setting to any extension of the village as release of other sites would result in the loss of lands that have higher landscape value. 2. Throughout any consultation process the concerns of local residents needs to be taken into account. It is expected that local residents will want to preserve the village feel and setting that they currently enjoy. With this in mind it is suggested that the Council should consider the release of smaller sites in order to satisfy housing need for the area in order to preserve this village feel and setting. The release of a larger area in one block of over 30 houses would create a significant new estate within the village and affect the balance of village life. Smaller pockets should therefore be released to maintain the balance of the village. 3. It is acknowledged that the village is currently served by narrow roads and few pavements. The release of the subject sites would allow contributions to be made for the improvements to the current infrastructure network for the safety of all residents of the village, both existing and new. Any developer of the site ADD10 is likely to argue that they do not need to contribute towards any improvements for existing road such as Caverswall Road as their development will be serviced by Caverswall Old Road, which connects with the A521 Cheadle Road. This will be to	See above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the detriment of residents in the village. 4. It is fair to say that the majority of sites being put forward in this area are within a flood risk area and all will need to be supported by a Level 2 SFRA. The diversion of the River Blithe will assist in the bringing forward of these sites in this regard. 5. It is acknowledged that access is currently gained via an unsurfaced and unadopted road. However, the owners of the land and access to it are supportive of the proposal and therefore the fact that it is currently unadopted and unsurfaced should not be seen as a barrier to its inclusion within the Local Plan as this can be upgraded at the time of development. 6. There have been concerns raised about the proximity of the sites to Blythe Bridge Wood. However, this should be seen as a positive for inclusion of the sites as their development would not only preserves the wood in full but also allow for the provision of the new access which could open up an access to Blythe Bridge Wood for many more people. 7. It is noted that the Council have confirmed that this site does not have any importance with regard to the landscape setting of the settlement.	
PO9514	Mrs Doreen Brough				Object	BB027 - Options Site I own land in Blythe Bridge marked as BB027 in your current new development plan to replace the local plan which allocates sites for housing. I understand that under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study (SHLAA) housing requirements should be reviewed and I wish to confirm that the above area be included for consideration to meet further requirements in the Blythe Bridge area. SMDC wrote to me in 2014 identifying my land for allocated housing and consideration. You asked for my intention as to whether I would be willing to release same for development. I confirmed at that time my consent for the land to be identified and considered as a suitable area for proportionally extending the conurbation of Blythe Bridge. I believe that this marked land area (BB0287) as a future housing development would not be a detriment to the area and surrounding environment. The land referred to would definitely meet the core strategy requirements re infrastructure (schools, roads, traffic, transport, landscape (offering community leisure space) nature conservation (adjacent woodland to encourage wildlife, bird and insect life) and the diverted River Blythe proves that the flood risk is negligible. Therefore this site has great potential, even though you seem to designate it as Green Belt, but in reality	See response to PO1430

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						it is more accessible than your current proposed 'green belt' preferred sites for large numbers of new housing in the Blythe Bridge/Forsbrook area. I would appreciate your comments on the above in view of the SHLAA requirements which have to be reviewed by yourselves for changing housing needs. I would appreciate your comments on the above in view of the SHLAA requirements which have to be reviewed by yourselves for changing housing needs. I hope this letter gives you a clear indication of my wish to have my land, referred to as BB027, included at some near future date within your proposed new Development Plan as per SHLAA.	
PO875	mr jonathan broadhurst				Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As is stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult on. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	• BB054 is a proposed site. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • BM021 and BM087 were both assessed as red. The Highway Authority advised that BM021 had access issues, existing access onto A521 is single width and adjacent to a watercourse. Major access improvements would be required. BM087 had potential landscape impact.
PO9469	Linda Washington and Robert Brough				Object	Traveller Site TR015 Quabbs Lane This lane is off the main road from Blythe Bridge to Cheadle. It is not a particularly wide road but is used by all types of traffic including many HGV's and emergency vehicles. This road is very busy at all	• This is not a proposed traveller site

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						times and vehicles towing caravans would cause untold problems for other road users. The road has a national speed limit and it would be an accident waiting to happen. Quabbs Lane is opposite Forsbrook cemetery where peoples loved ones are interred, everybody knows travellers have no respect for anybody that is not one of them. I would hate to see what would happen to the cemetery if they went in there. Our general concerns are personal. We moved to this area because we thought it was a pleasant low crime area. That will soon change if any of these sites happen. Property prices are bound to fall and crime will rise. The area would become somewhere people wanted to get out of rather than move to. Why are all the proposed sites in this area, Staffs moorlands covers 222 square miles so why all the proposed sites in one area? The Blythe Bridge sites are all close to the A50. When there is a problem on the A50, which happens frequently, Blythe Bridge and surrounding areas become gridlocked. Blythe Bridge is constantly busy with traffic and we do not need any more.	
PO883	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As it stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult	See response to PO875

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						on. As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	
PO890	Miss Emily Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As it stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult on. As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	See response to PO875

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO896	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As it stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult on. As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	See response to PO875
PO4830	Mr R Goodall				Object	I refer your letter of the 17/6/2014 in which you stated your council were looking to identify land which would be allocated for housing to be included in the new development plan to replace the local plan. Subsequent to your letter progress was made whereby my land BB028 was initially proposed as having possible midterm potential development but now it seems that you designated to remain in the Green Belt for the duration of your new plan. I write to ask that you consider keeping my land BB028 out of the Green Belt and keep the same in the White Belt	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						during this next development plan, with a view that this area could still have great potential as future Government Legislation may require Local Authorities meeting greater housing needs and targets than at the present. It has been disappointing that you could not advise why it was decided to keep my land BB028 in the Green Belt and would very much appreciate your comments to the above.	should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO9513	Mr R Goodall				Object	BB028 - Options Site I am a joint owner of land in Blythe Bridge marked by your reference as BB028 in your current new development plan to replace the local plan which allocates sites for housing. I understand that under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study (SHLAA) housing requirements should be reviewed on an annual basis and I wish to confirm that the above area be included for consideration as an ongoing mid-term potential site 6-10 years to 11-15 years to meet further requirements in the Blythe Bridge area. You wrote to me on 17 June 2014 identifying my land for allocated housing and consideration within the next development plan. You asked for my intention as to whether I would be willing to release my land for development. I confirmed at that time my consent for the land to be identified and considered as a suitable area for proportionally extending the conurbation of Blythe Bridge. I believe that this marked area (your ref. BB028) for future housing would not be a detriment to the green belt area and surrounding environment. The land referred to would definitely meet the core strategy requirements re infrastructure (for schools, roads, traffic, transport, landscape (ie offering community leisure space) nature conservation (adjacent woodland to encourage wildlife, bird and insect life) and the diverted River Blythe already proves that any flood risk would be negligible because of your own developments in the same area)). Therefore this site still has a sustainable suitability with all services available as opposed to proposed preferred sites for large numbers of new housing currently being suggested. It is important to note that various properties have access along the lane adjacent to BB028 as well as the use for agricultural rights of way, that legally no one user/resident can own the land because of its historic, continuous, uninterrupted use by all. Again, I would appreciate that you consider the site which you identified for mid to long term development be	See response to PO4830

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						annually renewed per SHLAA, and I would be pleased to hear from you following your request to me on 17 June 2014 and my co-operation in this matter.	
PO9482	Mr T D Blairs				Object	BB062 - Site Option 1. The landowners welcome the review of the Greenbelt that has been undertaken by the Council in an attempt to ensure that future housing requirements of the area are satisfied. Having established that the Greenbelt is impacting upon the Council's ability to satisfy housing need, the landowners consider that the subject site, with an area of approximately 0.94 hectares is better placed to provide a more balanced setting to any extension of the village as the release of other sites would result in the loss of lands that have higher landscape value. 2. Throughout any consultation process, the concerns of local residents needs to be taken into account. It is expected that local residents will want to preserve the village feel and setting that they currently enjoy. With this in mind it is suggested that the Council should consider the release of smaller sites in order to satisfy housing need for the area in order to preserve this village feel and setting. The release of a larger area in one block of over 30 houses would create a significant new estate within the village and affect the balance of village life. Smaller pockets should therefore be released to maintain the balance of the village. 3. It is acknowledged that the village is currently served by narrow roads and few pavements. The release of the subject sites would allow contributions to be made for the improvements to the current infrastructure network for the safety of all residents of the village, both existing and new. Any developer of the site ADD10 is likely to argue that they do not need to contribute towards the improvement of Caverswall Road as their development will be serviced by Caverswall Old Road, which connects with the A521 Cheadle Road, to the detriment of residents in the village. This will be to the detriment of other residents of the village. 4. Access to the site could be restricted to ensure that it is from Caverswall Road only to ensure minimum disruption to the junction of Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road. The owners do not consider the difference in heights to be a problem as this allows for greater visibility when exiting the site to ensure a safer junction. 5. It is fair to say that the majority of sites being put forward in this area are within a flood risk	The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						area and all will need to be supported by a Level 2 SFRA. The diversion of the River Blithe will assist in this bringing forward of these sites in this regard. Given the elevated position of the site it is considered that its release would result in new housing that was less likely to be affected by flooding. 6. It is noted that the Council have confirmed that this site does not have any importance with regard to the landscape setting of the settlement.	
PO9483	Mr T D Blairs				Object	BB086 - Site Option 1. The landowners welcome the review of the Greenbelt that has been undertaken by the Council in an attempt to ensure that future housing requirements of the area are satisfied. Having established that the Greenbelt is impacting upon the Council's ability to satisfy housing need, the landowners consider that the subject site, with an area of approximately 0.73 hectares is better placed to provide a more balanced setting to any extension of the village as release of other sites would result in the loss of lands that have higher landscape value. 2. Throughout any consultation process the concerns of local residents needs to be taken into account. It is expected that local residents will want to preserve the village feel and setting that they currently enjoy. With this in mind it is suggested that the Council should consider the release of smaller sites in order to satisfy housing need for the area in order to preserve this village feel and setting. The release of a larger area in one block of over 30 houses would create a significant new estate within the village and affect the balance of village life. Smaller pockets should therefore be released to maintain the balance of the village. 3. It is acknowledged that the village is currently served by narrow roads and few pavements. The release of the subject site would allow contributions to be made for the improvements to the current infrastructure network for the safety of all residents of the village, both existing and new. Any developer of the site ADD10 is likely to argue that they do not need to contribute towards the improvement of Caverswall Road as their development will be serviced by Caverswall Old Road, which connects with the A521 Cheadle Road, to the detriment of residents in the village. 4. It is fair to say that the majority of sites being put forward in this area are within a flood risk area and all will need to be supported by a Level 2 SFRA. The diversion of the River Blithe will assist	The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						in this bringing forward of these sites in this regard. 5. It is acknowledged that access is currently gained via an unsurfaced and unadopted road. However, the owners of the land and access to it are supportive of the proposal and therefore the fact that it is currently unadopted and unsurfaced should not be seen as a barrier to its inclusion within the Local Plan as this can be upgraded at the time of development. Access to this site could be shared with access to the sites discussed under BBO27/28 and thus any costs involved in the creation of this access would be apportioned between the two sites. 6. It is noted that the Council have confirmed that this site does not have any importance with regard to the landscape setting of the settlement.	
PO9486	Mr T D Blairs				Object	Heath House Farm - Blythe Bridge At this point I would also like to put a case forward for the release of some of the lands adjoining Heath House Farm, situated on the northern side of Caverswall Old Road. Heath House Farm has in recent year needed to diversify its interest in order to continue to operate in so much that there are large area of lands covered by greenhouses which serve the farm shop. This has effectively become a mini industry in itself and as such the lands should be considered “brown field.” Accordingly, as the Council acknowledges that the it would prefer to release brownfield sites in order to satisfy the housing needs of the area, the Council should consider the release of some of the lands currently covered by the structures attached to Heath House Farm as it looks to satisfy the housing needs of the area.	The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. There is some limited scope for brownfield sites to be developed under green belt policy.
PO8310	Mr Ben Weatherley				Object	Email containing covering letter and 6x supporting technical documents submitted: arguing for the inclusion of client's site "BB040" as additional housing allocation for Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook (and that allocating this site in combination with adjacent ADD011 is preferable to releasing BB054); encouraging the LPA to give further consideration to potential changes to the village and Green Belt boundaries in Blythe Bridge including to accommodate residential development on the land in client's ownership at Caverswall Old Road; arguing that Council should allocate further housing sites to improve housing delivery generally.	- Site BB040 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 consultation site was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Environment Agency advised regarding BB040 that previous land uses may have caused contamination and a Preliminary Risk Assessment would be required.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Remediation and mitigation measures may be required and could impact on development potential. • The Landscape & Settlement Setting Study identified BB040 as being important to the setting of the settlement. • The site is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land. The review found that BB040 could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.
PO4847	J.M. Belcher				Object	BB028 - Options Site I am a joint owner of land in Blythe Bridge marked by your reference as BB028 in your current new development plan to replace the local plan which allocates sites for housing. I understand that under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study (SHLAA) housing requirements should be reviewed on an annual basis and I wish to confirm that the above area be included for consideration as an ongoing mid-term potential site 6-10 years to 11-15 years to meet further requirements in the Blythe Bridge area. You wrote to me on 17 June 2014 identifying my land for allocated housing and consideration within the next development plan. You asked for my intention as to whether I would be willing to release my land for development. I confirmed at that time my consent for the land to be identified and considered as a suitable area for proportionally extending the conurbation of Blythe Bridge. I believe that this marked area (your ref. BB028) for future housing would not be a detriment to the green belt area and surrounding environment. The land referred to would definitely meet the core strategy requirements re infrastructure (for schools, roads, traffic, transport, landscape (ie offering community leisure space) nature conservation (adjacent woodland to encourage wildlife, bird	See comments on this site above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						and insect life) and the diverted River Blythe already proves that any flood risk would be negligible because of your own developments in the same area)). Therefore this site still has a sustainable suitability with all services available as opposed to proposed preferred sites for large numbers of new housing currently being suggested. It is important to note that various properties have access along the lane adjacent to BB028 as well as the use for agricultural rights of way, that legally no one user/resident can own the land because of its historic, continuous, uninterrupted use by all. Again, I would appreciate that you consider the site which you identified for mid to long term development be annually renewed per SHLAA, and I would be pleased to hear from you following your request to me on 17 June 2014 and my co-operation in this matter.	
PO8418	Mr John Grantham				Support	Various emails with attachments submitted promoting land north of Caverswall old Road [sites BB042+BB043 in the SHLAA] for housing; and clarifying Mr Nixon's ownership of these: Write to you to include the above land in the Council's ongoing strategic land review. The land...is approximately 16 acres in size. I believe this land would make a good contribution to the Council's housing targets going forward. The land is 16 acres in total but with Public Open Space and allowing for the topography of said land I would envisage 10 acres of housing development land, equating to approximately 130 dwellings, being delivered. A phased development over 3-5 year period could be achievable and is economically viable. The land has good existing access off Springfield Drive, Beverley Crescent, Hillside Avenue and Caverswall Old Road. With the land sitting adjacent to the existing settlement it is sustainable having the following facilities within the settlement of Forsbrook, Primary and Secondary schools, 6th form college, shops, library, buses and benefitting from two post offices and a train station less than a half mile radius from the proposed development. I hope you agree that this land offers great potential in assisting SMDC improve their housing shortfall targets.	The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. The site was identified in the L & SCA as being important to the landscape setting of the settlement it is considered the scale of site and landscape impact would make it unsuitable.
PO9108	Melanie Jackson				Object	SHLAA Site BB079 (not preferred option or site option) I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed HOUSING SITE in Blythe Bridge: Caverswall Road, Site ref number 2082 as described in your planning proposal BB079 dated 26/06/2015. My primary reasons for objection	This is not a proposed site

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. Information of your Large Site Assessment form indicates that this land has limited potential for residential development and that it provides a logical extension to settlement and relates to the settlement plan. This land is surrounded by individually built houses of varying ages and styles which will not be enhanced by mass housing, block paving and little or no natural attributed to these type of developments. These fields where the proposal lies is a valuable commodity for the village. It is accessed on a daily basis by many people as the well trodden public footpath across it bears witness to. It is filled with wildlife, flora and fauna. Add to this at least two natural sources of water that rise into the fields. To eradicate it from the face of the village is a travesty. Across the lane from Caverswall Old Road, adjacent to Heath House, lie the fields that back onto an already developed housing estate with access roads that contain pedestrian pavements off Hillside Avenue. Surely a viable proposal. Caverswall Road and Caverswall Old Road has no network for pedestrians, is not wide enough to take any substantial amount of traffic and quite simply without a fortune of investment to reinforce the crumbling road surface will not survive.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1369	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			Object	Map 4.27 - Froghall - major mixed use site - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation has been assessed in respect of the Grade II listed building Cottage Farmhouse in addition to the Caldon Canal Conservation Area and associated listed buildings, and the listed lime kilns and their settings, individually and cumulatively. Further information is required.	- There is one Grade II Listed Building within the site boundary and an additional five Listed Buildings in the 400m buffer. A Conservation Area is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. - The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that the site is located in an area which has been predominantly used for industrial purposes in the past: the Listed Building is however set within an area of former orchard and land to its rear. The canal has a close association with the industrial and natural landscape and its setting contributes to its significance. Despite this, appropriate development can be mitigated through the setting back of development boundaries from the Listed Building and Conservation Area and through conservation of the Listed Building. Screening should be employed along the northern site boundary. The site is within the HLC type of industrial and extractive complex. Development would not affect this HLC.
PO2708	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	Froghall – Much of the site is within the floodplain. Although it is likely that the Local Authority will wish to see redevelopment here despite the flood risk, the Shirley Brook and Blackbank Brook that converge just to the north of the site bisecting the development area and running into the Churnet, are not modelled in detail and this will need to be done prior to allocation to understand what could be delivered there.	Comments noted. Further discussions have taken place with the Environment Agency regarding flood risk relating to this site.
PO2802	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	This site (50) is Brownfield and according to information held by the Environment Agency it is located above a historic landfill site. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information. The previous use also as a copper works is likely to have caused heavy contamination. There is a risk of pollution to the watercourse if not managed and remediated properly during redevelopment. So although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to coast/constraint, Froghall may require lengthy remediation works, and sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	Comments noted. SMDC Environmental Health support redevelopment of the site but acknowledge that there is heavy contamination and that careful design should minimise very significant remediation costs by allocating low risk uses to the more contaminated areas.
PO2875	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	The Froghall Preferred Mixed Use Site needs to take account of the substantial historic built, historic landscape character and archaeological potential within the area of the scheme and the general vicinity. It should be aware of the nearby historic plateways (early railways), canals, limekilns etc which play an important part in defining the unique character of the Churnet Valley. Any proposal for the development of this site should consider how to incorporate this important cultural heritage and the development of opportunities to enhance the historic character of the area.	See response to PO1369 regarding historic character.
PO2889	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County			General comment	The Froghall Preferred Mixed Use Site needs to take account of the substantial local biodiversity and of connectivity of habitats within the Churnet Valley in layout, design and distribution of use. The site should incorporate green infrastructure which maintains and enhances connectivity.	The Council has produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation alongside the next draft version of the Local Plan. The strategy identifies green infrastructure corridors and lists particular issues in relation to that corridor which can be addressed as part of the relevant site policy and / or at the

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
		Council					planning application stage.
PO199	Mrs Sue Higton				Support	Any development here will look better than the existing demolition site and the recent new business in what remains of the factory is a step in the right direction. It's important to get the right mix of use for this site and especially to include a healthy number of starter homes - youngsters in the local villages would like to stay in the area but can't afford to. Many people have objected to development of this site on the grounds of increased traffic but they conveniently choose to forget how much traffic the Boltons site generated in its heyday.	Comments noted.
PO831	Ms Alison Conybeare				Object	Ipstones is a smaller village, so should not be listed under the larger village allocations. Boltons is a contaminated area and has already been identified as a key tourist opportunity site.	- Core Strategy Policy SS6a lists the larger villages which includes Ipstones. - Bolton's site is included in the Churnet Valley Masterplan as an opportunity site.
PO431	Mr David John Allen				Object	Better confined to employment only for this site.	Comments noted.
PO566	Mr Peter Cowie				General comment	Housing should not be constructed at Bolton Copperworks since it is a severely contaminated site and unfit and unsafe for human habitation. All development in villages should follow local plan guidance and serve the needs of the village rather than central government requirements for house construction and financial incentives to local authorities.	Comments noted. Redevelopment of the site would require remediation of contaminated land.
PO1414	Mr P Price				Object	I believe the former copper works should be reserved and largely restored to a wildlife and amenity area as part of the churnet valley. Housing in this location is not sustainable as there would be no services available to its residents shops, schools, Dr's etc , resulting in this remote location in increased car used community in remote location. This area could become a real tourist/wildlife gem if restored sensitivity and not over developed. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to set something special up for future generations. We should grasp it with both hands.	- Comments noted. The Core Strategy identifies the Bolton Copperworks site as a major developed area in the countryside. Due to its location and the nature of the site it states that any housing permitted should be limited to that required to cross-subsidise other uses. The Churnet valley Masterplan suggests that this should be around 50 dwellings. - See response to PO2889 regarding green infrastructure.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
PO9538	Ms Kay Bartlam				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Object for the following reasons: Highway safety - Willfield Lane, High Lane and Fairfield Avenue; Damage to habitats - birds, badgers, foxes, weasels, hedgehogs; Site is close to an ancient woodland (Tinster Wood); Flooding due to old drainage system; Area used for recreation e.g. dog walking; Loss of Green Belt land; and Loss of amenity for nearby residents including disturbance from building work. Prefer to see development on BE032 and infill plots.	- Highway Authority have no objection in principle to the development of land for housing, subject to provision of adequate access, visibility, internal layout and design. - The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site has low to medium biodiversity value overall in terms of the area recommend trees and hedgerows are retain if the site is developed. - The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was moderate and recommended the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances and that development could be part of the enhancement of recreational opportunities in this location, the site bordering scrubland and well-used footpaths running southwards towards Stockton Brook. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. - Issues such as overlooking will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
							that application. Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations • Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. • Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan..
PO9563	Mr Chadwick				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Object to development of BE041 for the following reasons: Site is Greenbelt; Site provides a significant contribution to the definition, context and setting of the village; Site prevents the village sprawling towards Stockton Brook and Endon; If development goes ahead here it will be difficult to refuse other landowners the right to develop their land; Do not agree that the site is an infill site; Development would blight surrounding countryside amenity permanently; Development would overlook my property; Adjoining footpath will become a short cut to the shops; Impact of building work on residential amenity; Should not put all the houses on one site; Object to Brown Edge being referred to as urban - it is a village, not Hanley; Ecological interest on the site - bats, newts, frogs, toads, kestrels, sparrowhawks, owls, badgers; and over the last 25 years various coins have been dug up in the area, one medieval and one roman found only 3 metres from the site boundary so the area does have historical interest.	• See response to PO9538 regarding green belt, residential amenity & ecological issues • The Local Plan will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. • The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential heritage and landscape impacts of the development allocations. The Study found the site is of low landscape sensitivity and is suitable for development in heritage terms. There are no designated heritage assets within the 400m buffer. It states that "Site comprises a field on the southern edge of Brown Edge, enclosed by a combination of existing residential development, or trees and hedgerows. The site slopes down from a track on the north-east boundary to Willfield Lane on the south-west boundary. Thus the higher land to the north-east of the site has higher visual prominence, with long distance views available to the south-west. However development would be viewed behind and adjacent to existing development. The existing settlement edge is strong but urbanised, existing established vegetation on the south-eastern

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
							<i>boundary could be strengthened in order to create a vegetated edge to the settlement."</i> • Brown Edge is classed as a larger village in the adopted Core Strategy.
PO10249	Mr Andy Brown	Harlequin Development Strategies (Crewe) Limited	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP	Support	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Support inclusion of this site in the plan for housing development (on behalf of client) for the following reasons: Have previously sent technical information to the Council in response to the Site Options 2015 consultation supporting the development of this site, namely - access plan (re: services and facilities), landscape and visual appraisal, ecology study, vehicular access drawing and an indicative layout for 48 dwellings; Site has a willing landowner and willing developer; Highway Authority has no objections to development of 50 dwellings in principle; Green Belt Review recommends site is considered for release from Green Belt; An updated site specific landscape and visual appraisal has been prepared and concludes that the release of the site would have the least impact on landscape and visual amenity compared with the other sites which are potentially available and would have a limited impact on the wider landscape being barely visible from long range receptors on the Staffordshire Moorlands Walks and other footpaths; Further drainage investigations have been undertaken and demonstrate that foul and surface water can be discharged from the site in a suitable manner and a drainage system to adoptable standards can be achieved on this site without increasing flood risk or drainage issues elsewhere; Ecology - species specific studies for reptiles and bats are attached and conclude that there would be no constraint on the proposed allocation in this respect; Whilst the site is located within the Green Belt, it is required to meet the open market and affordable housing needs of Brown Edge given that opportunities to deliver housing on previously developed land and infill sites within the existing settlement boundary are severely limited; and Brown Edge is a large village in the rural area but with a good relationship to higher order settlements and as part of the overall strategy cannot be excluded from helping to meet the housing requirement for the rural area and the release of land from the Green Belt would also enable local affordable housing needs to be met.	Comments and landowners/developer support for development of the site is noted
PO9558	Mrs J Simpson				Object	(Summary of response - full comments attached) Object to the development of this site for the following reasons: Site is Green Belt and would extend the village boundary; There are issues with surface water nearby in parts of Meadow Road; 50 houses would create a lot of disturbance to existing residents during building work; Additional traffic onto Willfield Lane and High Lane would cause highway safety issues due to numbers of vehicles and speed; and Lack of infrastructure/schools to support new residents. New housing should be accommodated on brownfield sites in Stoke on Trent.	• See response to PO9538 regarding green belt. flooding, residential amenity & highway issues • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
							should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure/schools to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure/schools Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure/schools necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure/schools providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure/schools Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See PO9538 regarding brownfield sites • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.
PO10253	Ms Debbie Evans				Object	After attending the meeting in May I realised how many people were against BE041 with many concerns about the very narrow road leading to Moss Hill, as I use this road every day I understand as sometimes it is almost impossible to get through reversing back many times for on coming traffic, more traffic would only make this situation even worse.	• See response to PO9538 regarding highway issues
PO1157	Mr GJ Perry				Object	As a long term resident of Brown Edge I would refer to the proposed development of Brown Edge and the confirmation of 50 houses required before 2021 I would like to comment as follows. I have no objection to the limited increase in the size of the village as I can appreciate the need for more housing as the population of the area increases. My main concern is that the proposal for 50 houses in one area only is not acceptable for the village and should be spread over several sites as linear development. As this is not possible at present, careful consideration should be given for the site location and the type of housing. A proposal for development off Willfield Lane on plot BE041 is inadvisable for several reasons such as severe congestion of the narrow lane, inadequate main services safe access to the main road, destruction of productive farmland and many species of wildlife including confirmation by the Staffordshire	• See response to PO9538 regarding the size and location of the site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						wildlife officer of the presence of polecats. A preferred location would be BE032 which has unimpeded access to the main highway, adequate main services and no desecration of an ancient lane, mature trees and wildlife.	
PO1061	Mr G Cooper				Object	Do not think we need such a large site to accommodate the houses required would be better with infill & small sites to retain the character & setting of the village.	• See response to PO9538
PO9437	Dr Vinod Patel				Object	Email received 22/05/16: Re sites BE 042 Wilfield Lane & BE 032 Breach road My knowledge of the area around these sites, dates as far back as 1970 when i started practicing and visiting as family doctor until 2001 when i retired. On that basis i would like say that there have been several accidents at Wilfield Lane, it being narrow and tortuous. This site ,042 , is marshy and floods heavily when it rains; water running down Meadow road eroding road surface. Problems also arise with increased frequency during winter months when the lane gets icy easily. In view of these facts and for the safety reasons, i would like to say that, site 032 - Breach road , be preferred for development rather than site 042. The Breach road site has direct access on to the main road which is wider and relatively safer.	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways, flooding & Site Options sites
PO1126	Mr Norman T Lomax				Object	Further to my remarks of site BE041, dated July 2015, copy enclosed, I herewith now list my objections for this proposal. Present Road Condition. Willifield lane unsuitable to accommodate the serious increase in traffic both during and following the development as my neighbour, Miss Glover and I have access to our driveways opposite the present field entrance, potential danger from manoeuvring vehicles at this point is paramount. A few metres past this point the lane bends and narrows considerably, causing regular blockades or accidents. Existing dwellings and mature trees would prevent any road improvements here. A dangerous stretch! Surface water Having occupied this address in willifield lane for several decades I have been able to observe the surface water leaving BE041 and its surrounding roads quite closely. Even taking into account the present capability of the ground to absorb the rainfall, the road quickly becomes flooded in storms or badly frozen over, submerging our footway and threatening our properties. My concern is that building on BE041 in this regard would make matters far worse. Aspect Now I'm in my ninth decade I am enjoying my garden and its open views opposite. I have mature trees, views of fields to the horizon and plenty of clear sky's to enjoy. This precious commodity would sadly be lost should this development go ahead.	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways, residential amenity & flooding
PO355	Mr T Hodgkinson				Object	I am 16 years old and have lived on Willfield Lane for all of my life. My house overlooks the field which has badgers, foxes, deer and numerous birds which is a joy to watch. I attend Stoke 6th Form College studying 4 A-levels. I walk down Willfield Lane to catch the	• See response to PO9538 regarding wildlife, flooding & highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						bus which is busy as its narrow with no pavement. If there were houses built on the lane this would make the possibility of accidents even greater. I know now that floods happen on the lane because the drains cannot take it, so more houses would make it even worse. I feel I am very lucky to have been brought up in such a beautiful area of Brown Edge and being so close to a lovely field with all of the wildlife. It would be very sad if houses were to be built right next door to my home.	
PO357	Suzanne Perry				Object	I am a resident of Willfields, Willfield Lane, Brown Edge, where my parents have lived since 1992. I am currently working in Ireland but have retained an interest in the village and visit regularly and consider Brown Edge my home. I am very unhappy to learn of the proposed development of the site on Willfield lane (BE041) for 50 new houses. When I drive home one of the real pleasures is to leave the city and cross the green belt into "country lanes" like Willfield Lane. These are historic stone walls and ancient trees that are an essential part of living in a village like Brown Edge. The lanes are just about coping with the volume of traffic we have currently but it is entirely unsustainable to expect up to another 100 cars, plus their visitors, moving trucks etc etc to use them without damaging them or causing a serious accident. In addition the BE041 site is used by dog walkers and hikers on their way up to Tinsters Wood and is a resource for the two estates already adjacent to Willfield lane as this is far closer than the village playground. It would be a shame to lose this resource and all the flora and fauna that go with proximity to ancient woodland. I appreciate there is a need for housing in the Moorlands, and that the village needs to offer space for development so I am not opposing any change. I understand that there is an alternative site being considered opposite Rock Cottage Nursing Home. This makes a lot more sense as a location for new development as it is closer to the village centre and is on a main thoroughfare. It is also closer to Endon School for those doing the school run in the mornings. It will allow the council to provide the required new houses and associated services without degrading what makes village life so special. As a current custodian of Willfield Lane I would like to preserve it for future generations to enjoy. Please register my objection to BE041.	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways, brownfields sites and wildlife • Public footpaths can be maintained or redirected.
PO1135	Mr Norman T Lomax				Object	I am free to confess a personal interest in this site having resided there for many years. Willfield Lane is completely unsuitable for access to BE041 and BE044. In fact a single pedestrian gate would be admirable. There would be no seating at this point but an official recreational gate and pathway through and the landscaped field would lead to the erstwhile football pitch. Here could be seating, small playground, with toilets, a pavilion, and a sports pitch. Brown Edge is in a dire need of bowls, cricket and football facilities! Many walking groups who use Bagnall to marshes hill route would greatly enjoy these facilities. A very sensible and much needed use of BE41	• An Open Space Sport and Recreation study is underway covering all designated public open spaces in the Staffordshire Moorlands, it will provide an audit of existing provision and highlight areas where there is a shortfall. New housing schemes depending on their size will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links in line with Local Plan policy.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						instead of unsuitable houses.	
PO477	Mr M Snape				Object	I am opposed to the proposed development off the site in the above area mainly due to the very narrow country lane and the increased number of the vehicle problems it will create in that area	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways
PO1149	Mr M Leese				Object	I am writing this letter in objection to the proposed building of 50 homes on the land at the back of my property, i am concerned about the lack of thought that has gone into this proposal. The people who live here have always believed their privacy to be protected by the Green Belt Land and the boundary of the said Green Belt has now been moved in order to accommodate up to 50 new homes. We who live here feel that our standard of living and privacy will now be affected by any new development and would like to outline the reasons for our objections and would also like to suggest an alternative site. 1. Supplementary Planning Guidance:- Planning policy section CF2 (D) states that in rural areas the provision of new housing should be restricted to meeting local housing needs and it is doubtful whether fifty families will be found from the village to fill the new housing so will the new occupants be from elsewhere? Section 2.6 H1.5 of the planning guidance says that there must be a proven need for so many houses and it says in section (D) that the development should be of a character appropriate to the location. The homes adjacent to the proposed site are 3 bedroomed semi-detached with large gardens to the rear and we would expect any new development to be of a like character and not a site crammed with low-cost homes with minimal gardens. We feel that any new development should respect local context and street pattern and in particular the scale and proportion of existing buildings. 2. Traffic:- As councils are under constant pressure to increase up take of public transport and reduce the number of cars on the road, why would this site be classed as suitable when it will only increase the amount of traffic flow on to an already at peak times busy road, think Fifty homes with maybe two cars per household. It is unacceptable for this amount of traffic to flow on to Willfield Lane and the surrounding areas. Things to take into account are whether safety is compromised, visibility, car parking and the effect on the locality due to said increased traffic flow. 3. Privacy:- We believe that as some of the land behind may be elevated, that the local planning department would in the future be able to give guidance as to what would be considered an unacceptable loss of light according to their policies. If the housing proposal was allowed to go ahead we believe it could result in us being severely overlooked from the top rooms of the new development resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. We would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states "that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land". We believe	• See response to PO9538 regarding green belt, residential amenity, highways meeting housing need & the Site Options sites • Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area consideration will be given to the scale of development and its impact on the surrounding area. • Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						any overlooking development would have a dominating impact on our home and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states "that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life" 4. Alternative Sites:- Many people believe pockets of land throughout the village could be used to accommodate the housing quota, thereby lessening the impact. Two sites we would like to recommend are BE056 Newfold Farm and BE032 Breach Road both owners of these sites have expressed a desire to make there land available for housing. Nether site will affect the boundary of the village detrimentally and both have better access than the proposed site off Willfield Lane. The site on Breach road is our preferred option as it lies off the main road and is easily and readily accessible and is a site that will not over look any existing properties. Any disruption would be down to a minimum on this site including drainage, cabling etc. At the parish council meeting the councillors informed us that the owner of the land wishes to release the site for Housing development, if that is the case then I would urge you to carefully consider this site over the proposed site at BE041 Willfield Lane in light of the impact that the current proposal would have on the locality. I trust that you will take our concerns on board when making your final decision.	
PO1160	Mr AJ Cartlich				Object	I am writing to make my objections to the proposed site BE041 and all other sites that are on existing green field sites as there are more than enough pockets of land within the existing village borders to accommodate the required housing stock. To build a probable 50 houses on this site would be detrimental to the area as they would increase the traffic flow in Willfield lane which is already overused and could not be widened past this site due to the narrowness between existing properties going southwards to the one way system As the owner of the house adjacent to the proposed site and living here for the last 45yrs and my wife was born here 70 years ago and having six windows overlooking this field I think I have as good a knowledge of this site including of both the good and bad as anyone. The good things about this site is the biodiversity as this field has not been used for many years for any purpose it has gradually gone back to nature thus bringing back many variety of wildlife including voles,field mice,weasels,foxes badgers and polecats The birds feed on the grasses and the buzzards are regularly seen hovering over the field,at night the bats fly around the hedgerow between the road and the field for this reason alone this site should not have been chosen. The bad things about using this site is the constant flooding from this field the field is fed by two natural springs one rising out of the ground under the hedgerow opposite Caroline crescent and the other used to rise in the centre of my drive as this used to be part of the field until it was purchased from the owner,to alleviate the problem that this caused permission	See response to PO 9538 regarding site size & location, highways, wildlife, flooding and residential amenity and PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						was given by Mrs Clowes the late mother of the present owner to Carry out work in the field to divert the spring water back into the field this was done at great cost to myself a 3mtr deep trench was dug from the rear of my garage down to The bottom of the field where a 4mtrX4mtr soak-away was dug both the trench and the soak-away were filled with large hardcore and the ground relevelled this copes with the spring water but not the rain when it rains a small pond forms and the excess water runs through the sand stone wall across the grass verge and merges with the water from the other Spring in the gutter this overpowers the drains and the excess crosses the road and runs down Meadow road causing problems to the bungalows at the bottom The drains in meadow road overflow and during heavy rainfall sewage rises from the drains.so for this reason flooding this site should not be used.? Traffic is a constant problem and to widen the road this would require the removal of the existing hedgerow and trees thus losing the biodiversity that these give to the area. It is my opinion that the two sites on breach road are by far less detrimental to both biodiversity,traffic problems and flood nuisance than this site and can not understand why this site was chosen as preferential a response to this letter would be appreciated. These plans are objected to for the following reasons, Added congestion to Willfield Lane, Willfield Lane already struggles to deal with the amount of traffic which passes through this lane, the road is not wide enough for this traffic and there is no scope to widen this enough to cope with the extra traffic 50 additional houses will cause. Amount of accidents which have already occurred on Willfield Lane due to the speed which traffic uses this road. Additional traffic as a result of the housing development would only increase these risks. Amenities of the village are already stretched to the maximum threshold . Due to the fact that the field had been for planning many times previously including going as far as central government and was rejected, on this basis as green belt land I extended my home which contains 6 windows overlooking this field and therefore if houses were built this would not only spoil this view it would also have a detrimental affect to the value of my home. Brown Edge school does not have the capacity to take any more pupils , it struggles to cope with the demand of the existing village at the moment and therefore the houses proposed would attract the family market and in turn children who would need schools which are not available. The ongoing water problem which during heavy rain causes flooding from the field into Willfield lane , Caroline crescent and meadow road this would be increased due to the amount of houses and also the loss of the field which currently acts as a barrier and soaks away excess flood water. There has recently been 5 additional houses constructed on Willfield lane and these alone have caused congestion , road disturbances and have proven that if the road cannot cope with this additional traffic then	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						what would another additional 50 houses cause? The proposed field has for many years been used by the village community as green land and used for walking and enjoying the countryside and village community, this would reduce the amount of walking space available for this village community, lots of wild life has returned to this area over recent years including foxes, badgers and polecats the latter being a protected species. We would strongly recommend for safety and community reasons these plans are rejected.	
PO358	Nicholas Follett				Object	I am writing to you about the proposal to build 50 houses on the site off Willfield Lane known as site BE041, and my utter disbelief that you could consider to put even more traffic down what is basically a single track lane for the majority of its length. This lane only last year had a serious traffic accident, in which a car ended up on its roof with two occupants inside, with fuel spilling from the fuel tank on to the road. The emergency services turned up entering from the proposed site end of Willfield Lane with the car in the middle section of the lane, the so called wider part, only to find that the fire engine could not get to the fuel spilling on the road because it could not fit through. By this time, traffic following on behind the emergency vehicle had blocked the lane from both sides. Only on quick thinking of the residences living on Willfield Lane, they allowed the traffic to back into their driveways, allowing the fire engine to reverse all the way back out of Willfield Lane till it could turn into Caroline Crescent, then go round through Ball Lane to enter from the other side of Willfield Lane to aid the over turned vehicle. This manoeuvre took approximately 20 minutes, luckily there was no fire and the occupants had managed to scramble out of the overturned car helped by residents. This accident all took place on a nice sunny Sunday afternoon where visibility was as good as it gets on the lane and possibly at the least busy time. If this accident could happen then, just imagine potentially another 100 cars using this narrow lane adding to the motoring rush hour to the schools. Also the same later in the day, with the normal stand-off between car drivers not wanting to give way to each other, all this blocking the lane. At the bottom of Willfield Lane, where it joins the top of Moss Hill, is possibly one of the worst corners in the local area, scene of many a coming together all year, due to the amount of traffic passing down the lane, at this current time. Living at 8 Willfield Lane, opposite the proposed site we also have an issue with drains, that barely cope with rain water and foul water, which in turn causes problems in Caroline Crescent, Meadow Road, even as far as Ball Lane. The site proposed has long been green belt with people from the local community enjoying the wildlife, foxes, badgers, rabbits and bats. To start losing these things is the start of Brown Edge not being a village. Services in the village are not the best. We have an hourly bus service, not a shop open after 6 PM and a school, that when my children went 15 years ago, had class sizes of 32 plus, and still are	See response to PO9538 regarding highways, flooding wildlife green belt and Site Options sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						not better. I know there are other proposed sites with far better access from proper roads, i.e. Breach Road BE032 and High Lane BE060. Both sites probably have similar issues with drainage but neither of these sites could potentially cut off emergency vehicles reaching our village, liked the proposed use of Willfield Lane. Thank you for taking the time to read my objection and observations to the site at Willfield Lane BE041.	
PO371	Mrs G M Cooper				Object	I am writing with reference to the proposed site of 50 Houses to be erected on Willfield Lane.Brown Edge. These Plans are objected to for the following reasons. Willfield lane. already struggles to deal with the amount of traffic that passes through. The Lane is very narrow, There is no scope to widen the road to deal with the extra traffic this site would cause of 50 Houses. We have lived here for 17 Months. In the first 3 months of residence we had our wall knocked down, it was so bad it was an insurance claim.We also saw a dog killed, this was all caused by speeding drivers. it is used at times like a race track. Also the people that lived in the property before us told us the wall had been knocked down twice before. Across from us on the other side 5 houses have been erected and these have caused congestion, and road disturbance, If this has caused so much problem, I dread to think what another 50 Houses would do. I believe another site on Breach Road has been proposed to build these houses, which makes more sense as this is on a main road and more accessible. Thank You For Taking The Time To Read the objection I have Outlined And look Forward To Your Response	See response to PO 9538 regarding highways and Site Options sites
PO1298	Mr and Mrs A Powell				Object	We both appose of the above address would like to express our concerns about the planned green belt land in our village. There is plenty of building plots within the village boundary without extending out to the other green belt. Also there are other issues to be considered? The Village School will not be big enough. The wildlife we have bats newts and owls, foxes and even pole cats have been seen around the Willfield Lane and Carlton Avenue sites. Transport we only gave 1 bus and hour, a house sale has just fallen through on the Village because the people who wanted to buy it had not got a car, and couldn't get to work. If you want to put affordable housing for less well-off they too may not be able to afford a car. Jobs/employment there is no work in the village. Does brown edge need any more dwellings? There are at least 30 houses already for sale at this moment, and about 10 being built these 10 houses will take the village in danger of exceeding its infrastructure. Road any building on the Green Belt in Willfield Lane and Carlton Avenue and Woodside Avenue are all concrete under the Tarmac. Woodside is already seriously damaged and unadapted Roads which will leave residents fuming and Willfield lane will have to be seriously widened and so spoil the look of the village. We do not need a housing estate. Please consider our village the plan to build where it will not spoil our village	See response PO9538 regarding highways, ecology, need for new housing,

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
PO1152	Ms Janet M Clement				Object	I am writing with regard to above proposal for 50 houses to be built at the rear of my property on Fairfield Avenue, Brown Edge. I would appreciate it if you could take my valid points into consideration for the proposed application as I object due to the following reasons - - the access on Willfield Lane is not suitable for the extra traffic that these additional houses will bring and the lane itself is very narrow and follows from a one-way access with one pull-in available for passing and there has already been accidents in this area due to speed and the narrowness of the road, which will only increase with more through traffic. - the school etc are already at their limit. - I moved to the property over twenty years ago and one main selling point was that it was green belt (and knowing that planning permission had been rejected for this field on previous occasions) felt secure that my property would never be overlooked at the rear. - Also if these additional houses were to be built it would affect the value of my property (which is not acceptable as it is out of our hands -and this would not be compensated). - the height of the additional properties will overshadow my property greatly (with no additional coverage hedge wise or even a back entry being made available for vehicle parking). I really feel unhappy with this planning proposal in so many ways - I chose to live there because of the green belt and paid for that. Now to find that it can just be taken away by others -which is not acceptable. I know no-one really wants additional properties building in their back yard, but surely a more accessible location would be on the main Sytch Road/Breech going out of Brown Edge, where properties will not be affected in the same way. Also why not on the opposite side of the village. Needless to say I sincerely hope that you take my objections serious and if you want to talk about this directly I shall be available.	• See response PO9538 regarding highways, green belt, residential amenity, Site Options Sites • PO 9558 regarding infrastructure/schools/schools
PO352	Mrs Mary Perry				Object	I have been a homeowner in Brown Edge for nearly 40 years. I am actively involved in Village life and would like to see the Village preserved for future generations as the attractive Moorland Village that brought me to live here. I object strongly to an area of Green Belt being built on to provide 50 houses. There is no evidence that the Village will require this number of homes. As these houses are not needed by the Village, they will attract more people to the Village. This is unsustainable. There are no opportunities for employment, the local schools have few vacancies and public transport is poorly provided. New residents would be forced to drive to work and school on already severely congested roads. I am objecting to development that is unsustainable and is not required by the needs of the Village. There is no evidence for needing 50 more houses. The natural development of villages is linear, following the main roads and using infill where possible and only when necessary. This allows newcomers to the village to be absorbed into the community. Welcoming over a hundred new residents is challenging for a village. What is proposed in this Plan is an estate of	• See response PO9538 regarding green belt, size and location of development, highways, wildlife, Site Options sites and residential amenity • PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools and the need for housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						mainly new residents, unable to find work and schooling in the Village, with little chance of ever becoming assimilated. I want to specifically object to the development of BE041 (land off Willfield Lane). This site is much higher than the existing houses and will dominate them. There will be loss of an amenity particularly for walkers. Residents are extremely concerned that more houses would deplete the already inefficient mains services. It will also bring more traffic on to Willfield Lane adding to existing problems. The Lanes in Brown Edge are ancient, very attractive and immediately distinguish Brown Edge from the streets of the city. They are all worth preserving. Willfield Lane has very old beech and oak trees. Walkers on the Lane at night can often see owls near the trees. Riders from the nearby stables regularly ride along the Lane. Construction traffic will disrupt and damage the lane forever. Traffic from the proposed development would use the junction with High Lane. This junction is already very dangerous with poor sight lines. This field has been used for grazing and contributes to the natural diversity in the area; it has a high ecological value. On my nearby field we have seen hares, badgers, foxes, grass snakes, hedgehogs, newts, bats, toads, a weasel and a polecat. The undisturbed Green Belt habitat has allowed wildlife to flourish for generations. The field is very close to ancient woodland and high density housing would erode this surrounding area. The proposed field for development is on the south side of Brown Edge and will draw the Village closer to the Stoke-on-Trent conurbation. Is this a deliberate policy? The Green Belt was designed to separate the City and villages. This proposal reduces the separation. I am not against all development, but only planning which is against the best interest of the Village. New houses should as far as possible be infill and not draw the Village closer to Stoke-on-Trent. I had no objection to the proposed bungalows on Hough Hill that were approved by the Parish Council. I understand that Planning turned down this proposal in spite of little resistance to this development from the Village. I would support a very limited number of houses could be built on BE032, provided that they were kept close to Breech Road and did not extend too far into the field. These additional sites would better integrate new housing into the community in preference to allowing a developer to build 50 houses which would be his most economically viable option. I ask everyone involved in making these decisions to think very carefully about the long term damage that could be done to a Village community by making the wrong choices.	
PO338	Mr Anthony John Cartlich				Object	I strongly OBJECT to this site Could you please explain why this site has been chosen why should the village loose this it is probably the prettiest approach to the village surely the required properties can be found within the village borders.to open up this road and straighten out the bends would make this a much more dangerous and busy road thus causing more upset to the residents to the south	See response PO9538 regarding highways and size and location of the site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						of this site. (Photos of the site also submitted)	
PO9700	Gary Turner				Object	I wish to forward my objections to the proposed development site BE041. I have lived in Caroline Crescent for 22 years, and chose this area for its rural appeal. My children have grown up surrounded by fields and trees, and have been able to see lots of different species of wildlife, including frogs, newts, badgers, bats and many species of birds. The development of BE041 would eliminate a vast amount of this, and that would be a terrible shame. I personally don't feel that Willfield Lane would be suitable to take the extra traffic, and any modifications to the road to allow the extra traffic would only increase the chances of motor collisions at the end of our road. This is a direct concern of mine. Also the volume of traffic that uses Caroline Crescent would be likely to massively increase, hence higher risk of someone getting knocked over. I also don't think the schools in Brown Edge or Endon could cope with a large increase in pupils, and the current pupils would suffer as a result. Weather conditions are another factor. I have seen a lot of flooding at the bottom of our road in extreme rain storms. The removal of the fields will remove drainage and cause extra water to gush down bank. This could be a serious problem.	See response PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, flooding and response PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools
PO359	Susan Eason				Object	I wish to register my opposition to the above development. I feel that the site is unsuitable due to its position on a very narrow country lane which is hardly suitable for the volume of traffic at present. Building these extra houses not only will cause increased volume of traffic but will affect Fairfield Avenue as this will become like a rat run with cars taking short cuts to get to Endon and Leek. Fairfield Avenue is hardly wide enough for the owners cars which need to be parked on the road and the increased traffic will cause problems for the more elderly people with increased noise and problems crossing the road. I moved to Brown Edge years ago to be part of a village community with views over the back of my house for peace and quiet in my aging years. However if these houses are built not only will they bring extra cars extra people and also losing our privacy as the terrain is higher than our homes therefore we will be overlooked. At present we experience torrential downpours of rain which run down the road like a river as the drainage system cannot cope with the increased amounts of rain. If these houses are built it will encourage extra runoff problems. I look through my window and see the wildlife that is in the field and this would destroy their habitat and decrease the pleasure of the residents. If I had wanted to be enclosed on all sides by houses I would have bought a house on an estate. There are other places in Brown Edge to build on. One site could be Breach Road as access would be more adequate for these houses.	See response PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, residential amenity, flooding
PO339	Ms Shirley Hulme				Object	I wish to register my opposition to the proposed development of the site in Willfield Lane Brown Edge, numbered BE041. I feel this site is totally unsuitable for this proposed housing development. My	See response PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, residential amenity, flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						objection is due to its position on a very narrow country lane and the increased number of vehicle journeys it will generate in an area that already has a propensity for road traffic accidents. The lane in question connects the Brown Edge area with Stockton Brook and the A53. In places, this road is only wide enough for one vehicle to travel along at a time and, as a consequence of this, peak period usage is already treacherous. The possibility of a further 80+ cars using the lane will only further aggravate this already hazardous situation. I am also of the opinion that Fairfield Avenue will become a short cut for these additional vehicles wishing to access the A53 for journeys to Leek and beyond. Fairfield Avenue already has many cars and, indeed, larger vehicles parked outside its homes and the additional flow of traffic will make it a dangerous area for all concerned. Those who will use the exit of Willfield Lane onto High Lane will find that they already have very bad visibility in the easterly direction made all the more dangerous by the volume and speed of the traffic using this major arterial road. It is a dangerous and stressful manoeuvre which, again, is not going to be helped by an increase in the usage which BE041 being developed will create. At the present time, the change in weather patterns causing torrential downpours of rain is a problem for residents to the west of Willfield Lane due to the antiquated drainage system not being able to cope with the huge amounts of surface water. Flooding has been reported in the houses in Meadow Road and Caroline Crescent with manhole covers being lifted and raw sewage actually coming up in some homes. Increased housing on the Willfield Lane site will remove a large amount of natural water runoff exacerbating the problems now being experienced. The narrow lanes to the north of the site are already suffering due to the lack of parking facilities as they are unable to additionally park outside their own homes. They are, therefore, unsuitable for increased use as a thoroughfare and would not be safe or practical as such. Furthermore, this site is one of abundant wildlife which gives great pleasure to those people who live on its boundaries and who use the field for leisure activities. There are bats, badgers, foxes, deer and a myriad number of breeds of birds that will lose their habitat. This will greatly decrease the standard of life for residents. We in Fairfield Avenue and Willfield Lane do not want to be overlooked by houses built in this area. The terrain of BE041 is higher than our homes and we do not want to lose our privacy and the peace and quiet we currently enjoy. The increase in traffic is also unwanted by all concerned and we are most unhappy that our life and the area we love will be blighted by this proposed development. I look forward to receiving your written response in respect of the above issues as a matter of urgency.	
PO349	Leigh Johnson				Object	I would like to register opposition to the proposed development of BE041 Willfield Lane. My reasons are: 1) The location of the houses	See response PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, residential amenity, location of the site, Site Options

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						is inhabited by a wide variety of wildlife including birds, foxes, rabbits, bees etc and would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding environment. 2) The proposed entrance to the site will be located very near a bad bend of a narrow country lane this will inevitably lead to accidents and a higher volume of traffic on this road and the fairfield ave road. 3) Endon high school is already oversubscribed and another fifty populated houses would put extra strain on the school. This could lead to residents children having to attend a school that is a lot further afield. 4) The privacy of many of the surrounding homes will be breached as the site is in an elevated position. I truly cannot understand why such a beautiful landscape is being targeted for such a development when there are many sites that are not greenbelt available in near by towns. Even though I disapprove of any development in the area the original proposed site of Breach Road had far better access and a lesser effect on the environment and surrounding houses. I look forward to your response and hope that these issues are seriously considered.	sites See response to PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools
PO356	Linda Winkle				Object	I would like to voice my concerns regarding the proposed building of 50 houses on land off Willfield Road, Brown Edge for the following reasons: This would cause too much traffic on an already over used road. Flooding would also be a big problem. This field is a lovely nature area for all types of wildlife. The Breach Lane site would be far more appropriate.	See PO9538 regarding highways, flooding, wildlife and Site Options sites
PO5	MR DAVID MCGRATH				General comment	My personal concerns are with regards to the road access to this location. Wilfield Lane is a single track road with few passing points. It is already used as a rat run between the A53 at Stockton Brook and Brown Edge 50 houses could mean up to 100 more vehicles attempting to use this route along with the existing traffic. Measures would be required to prevent this. To add to this no planning applications should be accepted unless every property has space allocated for two vehicles to park off the road. To add to the increase in population I would also ask what will be considered for Schools and Public Transport which with regards to Buses is almost none existent.	See PO9538 regarding highways and PO 9558 regarding infrastructure/schools and schools
PO10254	Mr P F Bannister				Object	Proposed building site be041 Willfield lane, i strongly object to the plans to build 50 or so houses on this site the reasons been the road that links the site is just too narrow, you constantly have to give way or reverse to oncoming traffic it is impossible for this road to take any more traffic and 70 plus cars coming from a new estate would be a nightmare , turning right from the proposed site is a give way tee junction which is where my home is situated this also would not take any more access traffic waiting to get out of the junction .there has been numerous accidents over the past dogs been knocked down cars crashing on the bends , even cars taking the corners too quickly and over turning, i have also heard that you were planning a sports ground on the site ,having looked at the location the only parking would be in the surrounding streets which would not be at	- See response to PO9538 regarding highways, - The proposals do not include a sports ground or for existing dwellings to give up their gardens

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						all fair on the residents in and around Willfield lane , then we would have the noise don't forget there is 35 plus homes directly on the edge of the site that would be woken by shouting football fans not at all fair , if you decided to widen the road down the one way area there would probably 12 months of road closures which again cause that much disruption to the surrounding area of brown edge homes would have to give up their gardens, tree with preservation orders on them would have to be destroyed.	
PO360	Lynne Marshall				Object	Reasons against: 1. Increased traffic on Willfield Lane towards Stockton Brook which is already an extremely hazardous country lane It has an horrendous single-lane 'S'bend which has just one passing place, once you have passed this the curvature & narrowness of the road still makes it impossible to view oncoming vehicles - there's usually a slamming of brakes & someone has to try to reverse a few hundred yards one way or the other! It becomes even more aggravated when there are more cars behind you!! 2. Fairfield Avenue is certain to become a 'Rat-run'. In an age when everyone is in a rush, drivers are sure to cut through Fairfield to join the B5051 which takes them on to the main A53 Leek Road. Fairfield Avenue has many cars & many vans parked on both sides of a road in which many school aged children live. This is a tragic accident waiting to happen 3. Flooding/Drainage. The present drainage system cannot cope with any downpour! Even after light rain there is always water on the carriageway (for several hundred yards) which runs from the field for days after the rain has stopped - removing a natural run off will make this a far far greater problem. Homes in Avenues below have often suffered flooding 4. Current mains power sources and overhead power lines which run the length of this site would need to be removed and channel underground at great cost. 4. This field has an abundance of wildlife - many breeds of birds - many ground nesting, bats are seen at night, foxes, badgers. These all give great pleasure. They would all lose their habitat. It is also the most popular of dog walking areas, somewhere dogs can actually run! Being able to access this natural area brings about enormous health benefits to the many residents, both adults and children, who use it daily. 5. The proposed terrain is higher than adjacent homes, said new homes would infringe on residents privacy - a privacy for which we paid a premium!	See response to PO 9538 regarding highways, flooding, wildlife and residential amenity and PO 9558 regarding infrastructure/schools
PO1159	Mr M Buckley				Object	The proposal to place up to 40 new houses on this plot will cause serious problems and I therefore wish to register my objection. 1. The narrow road from Stockton Brook - Willfield Lane - which links the proposed site is already dangerous and inadequate. 2. Residents in part of Woodside Avenue and Meadow Road already suffer some flood damage as water runs off the field and down Meadow Road and into Woodside Avenue. . With the removal of soil to be replaced by concrete/tarmac the frequency of flooding is bound to increase. 3. Woodside Avenue (still unadopted) and Meadow	- See response to PO 9538 regarding highways, flooding, site BE032 PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools - National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet its own housing requirement

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						Road will be an obvious direct link or rat-run to the new properties from the direction of Norton. 4. The village can not sustain many more houses. The school is at present full; there is no Chemist or Doctor in the village; the Post Office is under threat - which also provides the only banking service to villagers. 5. But if houses have to be built - surely the proposed site with access off the main B5051 - Breech Road - would create least environmental, social and access problems 6. I must add that the principal is flawed - surely Brownfield sites in Stoke-on-Trent would be far more suitable for the proposed additional housing and far less damaging to rural life and be of great benefit to the City!	
PO51 PO43	Mr P Rushton				Object/general comment	The selection of site BE041 at Brown Edge takes no account of the road and infrastructure/schools problems which would occur. The effect upon the heavily populated area would be catastrophic and traffic problems insurmountable. If additional homes must be provided, a sensible solution is in-filling around the village boundary or, if an estate is an insistence, the areas offering the least inconvenience to the community is BE032 and ADD06. In the not too distant past Brown Edge had considerable employment sites occupied by a multiplicity of businesses. The SMDC Planning Authority have consistently allowed their replacement with houses, creating a situation which obliges residents to seek facilities and services in the adjacent City. Even before the proposed major housing development, Brown Edge is in dire danger of losing identity as a large Moorlands village and of becoming yet another urban housing area on the lines of neighbouring Norton but without the facilities and services. .	• See response to PO 9538 regarding highways, flooding, Site Options sites and the size and location of the site and PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools • Comments noted
PO969 8	Rees Davies				Object	To the surveyor responsible for planning houses on Willfield Lane, Brown Edge, Stoke-on-Trent. My name is Rees Davies and I live in Woodside Avenue Brown Edge and I have walked these fields over many years and you need to be aware that living in the under growth are: Many varieties of wildlife there including voles and Pole Cats and their habitat will be destroyed. Willfield Lane is a very narrow road not wide enough to take two vehicles passing each other, no footpaths and only one passing layby, local councillors have been on site in an attempt to solve the problem , attached is a photograph showing the problem. There is a much more suitable site off Beech Road with easy access to the Main Road leading to Leek or Norton When we have heavy rain the field gets very wet from the natural springs, the water floods into the road then down Meadow road into Woodside Avenue and the houses on the lower side, (the odd numbers) are flooded and insurance companies have paid out thousands on pounds in compensation over the last couple of years. I realize that the government are using pressure to build houses but this site is just not suitable for many of the reasons listed, there must be other sites more suitable. Photos of road	• See response to PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, Site Options sites and flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						attached.	
PO353	Helen Aston				Object	To whom it may concern I am writing with reference to the plans for the application to build houses on the plot in Willfield Lane Brown Edge. Having relatives who live next to this proposed plot I regularly use this road to visit them and in turn leave my two young children in their care whilst at work. Having visited them at this location for over 40 years I am fully aware of how Busy and dangerous at times will field lane is. Whilst 5 houses were being built on it not long ago this caused numerous dangerous situations due to heavy goods vehicles used during the build. I am against the proposition to build these additional houses on Willfield Lane due to safety reasons, the road cannot sustain any more traffic and traffic which would obviously increase due to a housing estate being built by such a large amount. The road is currently used as a race track by some drivers and very unsafe at times for young children and old people especially, this risk would increase with additional houses. I as a young child played in these playing fields and now in turn see my own children playing in them along with many other dog walkers and also other families with children. This field has been used for many years by the community of Brown Edge. I question the ethos around removing a well-established facility within Brown Edge a small village and replacing it with a housing estate which would increase danger to young children and the elderly (vulnerable people) and in turn endanger lives by creating a flow of traffic that a lane cannot sustain. Even if this lane was widened this would not take away the danger element. Thank you for taking the time to read my opposition, I look forward to your response,	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways • New housing schemes depending on their size will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links in line with Local Plan policy. • Public footpaths can be maintained or redirected.
PO1158	Mr and Mrs B Dean				Object	We are two upstanding residents of the Brown Edge area, writing to express our opposition to the development of site BE041, it would negatively impact the surrounding community for various reasons, mainly the surrounding area can simply not sustain the suggested increase in the community due to the housing estate. We are very unhappy with this proposed development and enjoy the area as it is.	• See response to PO 9538 regarding the need for site allocations and PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools
PO372	Mr and Mrs B Mountford				Object	We are writing in reference to the proposed build of new houses in Willfield Lane Brown Edge. Having been born in Willfield Lane Brown Edge and living on Endon Road Norton Green very close to the Brown Edge border for over 50 years we are fully aware of the village and it's surroundings. We currently travel across Willfield Lane frequently visiting relatives and have witnessed accidents and near misses on this road on many occasions. Construction a housing estate in an environment which is not suitable does not make any sense and only adds to the risk already in place for the community on such a busy lane. Surely as a council you have the responsible to ensure houses are built in a suitable environment? The village itself would not be able to accommodate another 50 houses as planned as its current facilities are already stretched there are only 2 spaces in	• See response to PO9538 regarding highways, and PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools • See response to PO5558 regarding the need for housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						the whole school and as the new houses would attract families the village school would not be able to accommodate these children. Taking all of these points into consideration and a council which promotes being committed to providing the highest quality of service and excellent value for money to our customer. Why would you authorise these plans? What about the current customers of Brown Edge?	
PO340	Mr Peter Guest and D Turner				Object	We wish to make our objection to the proposed development site formally known. We feel that this site is totally unsuitable for a variety of reasons. It is in an elevated position compared to where we are situated at the bottom of Caroline Crescent. In extreme weather conditions we have been known to experience flooding to the front of our property. The rain from the road will gush down the drive, and our drain trough at the bottom of the driveway is unable to cope, and so overflows into our garage under the door. The addition of a housing estate on Willfield Lane at the top of our street is only going to mean that the flooding will become a much worse problem for us. In all the time that we have lived here, we considered Willfield Lane to be a "Country Lane". There has already been a vast increase in the amount of traffic that uses this route for access between Brown Edge and Stockton Brook. If we take that route ourselves by car, we often have to stop and possibly reverse to allow oncoming traffic pass by. If we walk our dogs that way to gain access to the fields, we have to be vigilant and ensure that we are visible to drivers, and that us and our dogs are tucked right in to the edge. The addition of a housing estate is going to create a catastrophic increase in traffic along this route. It will remove the option of walking along that way, we feel that it would just be too dangerous. Access to the site would be another issue, and could possibly increase the risk of traffic collision on its junction. We have used that site for at least 20 years to walk our dogs and children up to the fields and woods. In doing so it eliminated us having to use neighbouring streets, and so the dogs would urinate on the grass and not on the pavement. We have been fortunate enough to witness the wildlife that currently exists around us, and building a housing estate would mean that bats, foxes, badgers and birds would lose their habitat. This would just be wrong for the area. We are a rural community, and want to stay that way. St Annes school would also be an issue. It is full to capacity as it is, how it could possibly accommodate a large increase in children. Surely this would mean our children who are already in attendance would suffer. Brown Edge may need more affordable housing, but how many of the houses will actually be affordable. They are quite likely to be bought by people who are financially stable, and will then go on to make money by charging rent to others who are not and never will be in a position to purchase their own property. The road where we live would be likely to become a cut through for their cars. Currently	• See response to PO9538 regarding flooding, highways, wildlife and PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools • Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						we live in a peaceful Crescent where our children can play, and we only occasionally have passing traffic. This is something else that would change, and it certainly wouldn't be for the better. We urge you to reconsider the proposition; we feel that it would be an all-round detriment.	
PO1312	Ms C Hollinshed				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development of the site in Willfield Lane, Brown Edge, No BE041. We feel this site is totally unsuitable for the no of houses proposed. Our objection is due to its position on a very narrow country lane and the increased number of road traffic accidents. The lane in question connects to the Brown Edge area with Stockton Brook and the A53. In places this road is only wide enough for one vehicle to travel along it at one time. Consequently peak period usage is already treacherous. The possibility of a further 80 plus cars will only further aggravate an already hazardous situation. Those who will have to use the exit Willfield Lane onto High Lane, will find that they already have very bad visibility in the easterly direction made all the more dangerous by the volume and speed off traffic using the arterial road. It's very dangerous and difficult manoeuvre which again is not going to be helped by a already hazardous situation. After the present time the change in our weather patterns causing torrential downpours of rain is a problem for residents to the west off Willfield Lane due to the antiquated drainage system not being able to cope with huge amounts of surface water. Flooding has been reported in houses in meadow Road and Caroline Crescent with manhole covers being lifted and raw sewage actually coming into our homes. Increased housing Willfied Lane will remove a large amount of natural water run-off. The narrow road on the estate to the north of the site are suffering from due to lack of parking facilities and are not suitable for use as access to this area. It is a very much a family orientated area, which will not be suitable for uses as a thoroughfare and would not be safe or practical as such. Additionally there is one of the abundant wildlife which gives great pleasure to those who live on its boundaries and use the field for leisure activities. There are bats, badgers, foxes, deer, and a myriad number of breeds of birds that will lose their habitat. This will greatly decrease our standard of life for residents. We do not want to be overlooked by houses built in this area. The terrain of BE041 is higher than our homes and we do not want to lose that feeling of privacy or live feeling like we are being constantly observed. As residents of Fairfield Avenue we are most unhappy that our life and the area that we love can be blighted by this proposed development.	See response PO9538 regarding highways, flooding, wildlife and residential amenity
PO1000	mrs susan jamieson				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development of this site in Willfield Lane Brown Edge , No BE041 . We feel this site is totally unsuitable for the number of houses proposed. Our objection is due to the position on a very narrow country lane and the increased no of vehicle journeys it will generate in our area that	See response PO9538 regarding highways, flooding, wildlife and residential amenity

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						already has had four road traffic accidents. The lane in question connects the Brown Edge area with Stockton Brook and the A53. In places this road is only wide enough for one vehicle to travel along it at one time; consequently peak period usage is already treacherous. The possibility of a further 80 plus cars using the lane will only further aggravate a already hazardous situation. Those who will have to use the exit of Willfield Lane onto High Lane will find that they already have very bad visibility in the easterly direction made more dangerous by the volume of speed the traffic using the arterial road. It is a dangerous and stressful manoeuvre which again is not going to be helped by an increase of usage which BE041 being developed will create. At the present time the change in our weather patterns causing torrential downpours of rain is a problem for the residents to the west of Willfield Lane due to antiquated drainage systems not being able to cope with huge amounts of surface water. Flooding is being reported in houses in Meadow Road and Caroline Crescent with manhole covers being lifted and raw sewage actually coming into some homes. Increased housing in Willfield Lane will remove a large amount of natural water runoff exacerbating the problems being experienced now. The narrow roads on the estate to the north of the site are already suffering due to lack of parking facilities and are not suitable for use as access to this area. It is very much a family orientated area, which is not suitable for use as a thoroughfare and would not be safe or practical as such. Additionally the site is one of abundant wildlife which gives great pleasure to those people who live on its boundaries and who use the field for leisure activities. There are bats, badgers, foxes, deer and a myriad number off breeds of birds that will lose their habitat. This will greatly decrease the standard of life for the residents.	
	mrs susan jamieson				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development of this site in Willfield Lane Brown Edge , No BE041 . We feel this site is totally unsuitable for the number of houses proposed. Our objection is due to the position on a very narrow country lane and the increased no of vehicle journeys it will generate in our area that already has had four road traffic accidents. The lane in question connects the Brown Edge area with Stockton Brook and the A53. In places this road is only wide enough for one vehicle to travel along it at one time; consequently peak period usage is already treacherous. The possibility of a further 80 plus cars using the lane will only further aggravate a already hazardous situation. Those who will have to use the exit of Willfield Lane onto High Lane will find that they already have very bad visibility in the easterly direction made more dangerous by the volume of speed the traffic using the arterial road. It is a dangerous and stressful manoeuvre which again is not going to be helped by an increase of usage which BE041 being developed will create. At the present time the change in our weather patterns causing torrential downpours of rain is a problem for the residents	See response PO9538 regarding highways, flooding, wildlife and residential amenity

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						to the west of Willfield Lane due to antiquated drainage systems not being able to cope with huge amounts of surface water. Flooding is being reported in houses in Meadow Road and Caroline Crescent with manhole covers being lifted and raw sewage actually coming into some homes. Increased housing in Willfield Lane will remove a large amount of natural water runoff exacerbating the problems being experienced now. The narrow roads on the estate to the north of the site are already suffering due to lack of parking facilities and are not suitable for use as access to this area. It is very much a family orientated area, which is not suitable for use as a thoroughfare and would not be safe or practical as such. Additionally the site is one of abundant wildlife which gives great pleasure to those people who live on its boundaries and who use the field for leisure activities. There are bats, badgers, foxes, deer and a myriad number off breeds of birds that will lose their habitat. This will greatly decrease the standard of life for the residents. We do not want to be overlooked by houses with built up areas. The terrain of BE041 is higher than our homes and we do not want to lose our privacy or live feeling we are constantly being observed. As residents of Fairfield Avenue we most unhappy that our life and our area that we love can be blighted by this proposed development.	
PO1334 PO1336	Miss L Chadwick				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development on this site of large field on Willfield Lane, Brown Edge, numbered BE041. This site we feel would be completely unsuitable for the proposed housing development. Our objection is due to increased traffic that will be generated on the narrow country lane, which has been the site of road traffic accidents in the past. This road is difficult to navigate as in places: it is only one car width wide. In winter it never gets gritted properly. Also without the field as a soak away the water would run down meadow road and into our street. There is an issue with the sewer system which was not built to accommodate the increased housing situation. In recent times of bad weather the manhole cover blew off, causing a torrent of water to flow down Meadow Road. Houses on the proposed site due to the foundations being dug etc will worsen the already limited drainage that's in place. If the proposed development were to go ahead various routes in the immediate area would experience increased traffic. These roads already have a large number of cars that have to park on the road/pavement. An increase of traffic negotiating these cars would almost certainly increase the risk of collisions, not to mention the children play near the roadside. Woodside Avenue is a private road that the residents have to maintain themselves. This would mean that the residents will have to pay on behalf of all the new traffic utilising the road. This is unacceptable. We look forward to receiving your written response in respect of the above issues as a matter of urgency.	See response to PO9538 regarding highways, flooding
PO133	Mr B				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed development on	See response to PO9538 regarding highways, flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
7	Chadwick					this site of large field on Willfield Lane, Brown Edge, numbered BE041. This site we feel would be completely unsuitable for the proposed housing development. Our objection is due to increased traffic that will be generated on the narrow country lane, which has been the site of road traffic accidents in the past. This road is difficult to navigate as in places: it is only one car width wide. In winter it never gets gritted properly. Also without the field as a soak away the water would run down meadow road and into our street. There is an issue with the sewer system which was not built to accommodate the increased housing situation. In recent times of bad weather the manhole cover blew off, causing a torrent of water to flow down Meadow Road. Houses on the proposed site due to the foundations being dug etc will worsen the already limited drainage that's in place. If the proposed development were to go ahead various routes in the immediate area would experience increased traffic. These roads already have a large number of cars that have to park on the road/pavement. An increase of traffic negotiating these cars would almost certainly increase the risk of collisions, not to mention the children play near the roadside. Woodside Avenue is a private road that the residents have to maintain themselves. This would mean that the residents will have to pay on behalf of all the new traffic utilising the road. This is unacceptable. We look forward to receiving your written response in respect of the above issues as a matter of urgency.	
PO1090	Mr M Leese				Object	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed site in Will field Lane Brown Edge which is numbered as BE041 for the following reasons: The site is totally unsuitable for this site is totally unsuitable for houses. The terrain of the field is higher than of the surrounding area and will cause any housing to be overlooking the adjacent property. The antiquated drainage system in the area cannot cope with surface water at present and flooding, man hole covers being lifted and raw natural sewage entering people's homes occurs now. Taking this field over for the building and a natural water runoff will exacerbate the problems. Willfield Lane is a really narrow winding lane which has an enormous continual use of dangerous exit and access problems. The addition of more vehicles will create an even greater hazard. We will lose a area which will greatly lower recreational life of our village as well as reducing the wildlife habitat. The roads surrounding the areas already have parking problems and are not suitable as a thoroughfare for further traffic. We do not want to be overlooked by houses built on BD 041 as we feel it will invade our privacy and we are most unhappy that our life shall be blighted by this proposed development.	See response to PO9538 regarding residential amenity, flooding, highways, wildlife
PO2046	Mr Bourne	Brown Edge Parish Council			Object	Wish to make the following comments on the Preferred Allocation Site BE041: The general consensus was that the Green Belt should be preserved to keep the natural boundary between Brown Edge (Staffs Moorlands) and the City of Stoke on Trent. The site is within	See response to PO9538 regarding green belt, flooding, highways and size and location of development

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						the designated green belt area. Existing storm and foul sewer systems could not cope with any large development as they are already overloaded and subject to overflowing and flooding. Increased highway traffic would create problems on narrow Willfield Lane and with its dangerous junction with the B5051 High Lane. There are numerous infill sites around the village which could be utilised to develop and count towards the total number of houses required. These comments are similar to ones made on the site in previous consultations.	
PO1292	Mrs K Hodgekinson				Object	With ref to the above I strongly disagree with proposal for the reason below; Destroying a picturesque lane Spoiling a beautiful view Destruction of trees, wildlife, bats, foxes, deer, etc. Danger for pedestrians especially children as they walk to school because of the increased traffic I brought my house in 1996 because of its location next to the fields Willfield Lane is beautiful tree lined lane which will be destroyed Disruption to Willfield Lane connects to Brown Edge to Stockton Brook and is already quite dangerous at peak times one of my only one car can pass at one time at certain times of the day. When it rains heavily flooding in Meadow Lane: Higher rise of accidents And Caroline Crescent because Willfield Lanes drains cannot cope with the Water	• See response to PO9538 regarding wildlife, highways, flooding •
PO354	Ms Kim Hodgkinson				Object	With reference to the above, I strongly disagree with the proposal to build 50 houses on the lane. I show below my reasons:- destroying a picturesque lane. spoiling a beautiful view. destruction of trees, wildlife, bats, foxes, deer etc. danger for pedestrians especially children as they walk to school because of increased traffic. the value of my property will decrease. I bought my house in 1996 because of its perfect location next to fields. Willfield Lane is a beautiful tree-lined Lane which will be destroyed. Disruption to Willfield Lane and surrounding areas because Willfield Lane connects Brown Edge to Stockton Brook and is already quite dangerous at peak times due to only one car can pass on a certain part of the lane - higher risk of accidents. When it rains heavily flooding occurs in Meadow Road and Caroline Cres because Willfield Lane drains cannot cope with the water. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.	• See response to PO 9538 regarding wildlife, highways, flooding
PO369	Mr John Dawson				Object	With reference to the proposed planning at BE041 in Willfield lane Brown Edge for 50 dwellings - as a resident whose garden backs on to the proposed green belt field and has lived in this location for 36years we feel there is other alternatives for developments within the village these being BE032 Breach Road, BE056 by Newfold Farm and BE 060 off High lane giving equivalent dwellings. We are concerned that the village and services and amenities are not capable to accommodate further developments. i.e no spare capacity at the local school, no public transport for commuting to the city and surrounding areas for work or leisure. On Willfield Lane there is an ongoing issue with water causing flooding in heavy rain	• See response to PO9538 regarding Site Options sites, flooding, highways and wildlife • See response to PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
						to Caroline Crescent and Meadow Road and this will increase if the field is developed. Also the road has had numerous accidents from traffic as this road cannot take excessive further traffic. Since living in this location we have enjoyed having various wildlife including badgers, foxes, owls, squirrels and more recently polecats which will disappear if developments occur. We are strongly against the development for our own reasons and the community. Thank you for time in reading the above objections and I look forward to your response at your earliest convenience.	
PO370	Miss J Glover				Object	With reference to the proposed site to build 50 houses in Willfield Lane, my objection to this proposal are added traffic volume in the lane, with the dangerous bends near to the proposed site. There are ongoing water problems during heavy rain, which to my concern causes flooding in Meadow Road, Willfield Lane and Caroline Crescent. My concern is that building on BE041 in this regard would make matters far worse. There have already been five additional houses constructed recently in Willfield Lane leading to an access in traffic. We think that there are enough owners willing to sell sites for development within the existing boundary to sustain the required housing requirements.	See response PO9538 regarding highways, flooding
PO1327	Miss J Glover				Object	With reference to the proposed site to build 50 houses in Willfield Lane, my objection to this proposal are added traffic volume in the lane, with the dangerous bends near to the proposed site. There are ongoing water problems during heavy rain, which to my concern causes flooding in Meadow Road, Willfield Lane and Caroline crescent. My concern is that the building on BE041 in this regard would make matters far worse. There have already been five additional houses constructed recently in Willfield Lane leading to a increase in traffic. We think that there are enough owners willing to sell sites for development within the existing boundary to sustain the requirements. I strongly recommend, for safety and community reasons that these plans be rejected and any new development take place elsewhere within the village.	See response to PO9538 regarding highways and flooding
PO1328	Mrs C Beardmore				Object	With reference to the proposed site to build 50 houses in Willfield Lane, my objection to this proposal are added traffic volume in the lane, with the dangerous bends near to the proposed site. There are ongoing water problems during heavy rain, which to my concern causes flooding in Meadow Road, Willfield Lane and Caroline crescent. My concern is that the building on BE041 in this regard would make matters far worse. There have already been five additional houses constructed recently in Willfield Lane leading to a increase in traffic. We think that there are enough owners willing to sell sites for development within the existing boundary to sustain the requirements. I strongly recommend, for safety and community reasons that these plans be rejected and any new development take place elsewhere within the village.	See response to PO9538 regarding highways and flooding
PO114	Mr and				Object	With regard to the above development site we wish to register our	See response to PO9538 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Org	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer response
7	Mrs P Lewis					opposition. We feel the site is completely unsuitable for a housing development because of its position on Willfield Lane. The Lane in question connecting Brown Edge with Stockton Brook is a narrow country lane, which is not wide enough for two cars to pass in places. We would also like to point out that three quarters of Willfield Lane has no public footpath, and at present with the amount of traffic it can be hazardous for the residents trying to enter onto the lane from their properties. The speed of 60mph partly along the lane has been an issue with the residents for some considerable time and a letter was sent to the Parish Council raising the issue. Therefore with the extra vehicles that 50 houses would bring, plus the already mounting traffic, i.e. milk tanker, tractors, hay balers, horses, horse drawn vehicles, children walking to and from school, it would increase the dangers along the lane considerably. On one of the numerous accidents along the lane an emergency vehicle was unable to gain access. We feel there are far better sites around Brown Edge for development, enhancing the village in a more complimentary way.	
PO707	Mr Clive Brandon Proctor				Object	With regard to the new housing development of Brown Edge and the choice of site (BE041) which I am sure as been chosen with great thought, taking in consideration all possible elements of the for and against concerns i.e. (1) Will the existing school adequately accommodate 50 more dwellings? If not is there any kind of plan to provide a larger replacement school should the demand require it? (2) What of the inadequate sewerage system which I believe struggles presently? (3) The narrow country lanes adjoining this site are also a concern. I do realise that these questions apply to all of the designated plots and so with this in mind perhaps the answer is NOT to build further housing on Brown Edge at all! All of that aside my concerns for site BE041 are of erecting 50 houses on the one site which will create yet another housing estate on our village pulling it even further toward a Urban City Sprawl. Surely, if this extra housing is to be forced upon a community that is already struggling with inadequate amenities, they should be spread around as smaller plots allowing the village to at least appear to retain the village atmosphere. Many thanks for allowing us to share our thoughts on this matter. Clive and Sheila Proctor	See response to PO9558 regarding infrastructure/schools/schools and PO9538 regarding site size
PO1293	Mrs K Hodgekinson				Object	I do not agree or will support the building works on Willfield lane because of its rural, beautiful location breach road is on my preferred site. No building should be carried out on green belt.	- See response to PO9538 regarding Green Belt - See response to PO9563 regarding landscape

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9438	Dr Vinod Patel				General comment	Email received 22/05/16: Re sites BE 042 Willfield Lane & BE 032 Breach road My knowledge of the area round these sites, dates as far back as 1970 when i started practicing and visiting as family doctor until 2001 when i retired. On that basis i would like say that there have been several accidents at Willfield Lane, it being narrow and tortuous. This site ,042 , is marshy and floods heavily when it rains; water running down Meadow road eroding road surface. Problems also arise with increased frequency during winter months when the lane gets icy easily. In view of these facts and for the safety reasons, i would like to say that, site 032 - Breach road , be preferred for development rather than site 042. The Breach road site has direct access on to the main road which is wider and relatively safer.	These sites are not proposed for housing in the Preferred Options consultation
PO1124	Mr Norman T Lomax				Object	Further to my remarks of site BE041, dated July 2015, copy enclosed, I herewith now list my objections for this proposal. Present Road Condition. Willfield lane unsuitable to accommodate the serious increase in traffic both during and following the development as my neighbour, Miss Glover and I have access to our driveways opposite the present field entrance, potential danger from manoeuvring vehicles at this point is paramount. A few metres past this point the lane bends and narrows considerably, causing regular blockades or accidents. Existing dwellings and mature trees would prevent any road improvements here. A dangerous stretch! Surface water Having occupied this address in willfield lane for several decades I have been able to observe the surface water leaving BE041 and its surrounding roads quite closely. Even taking into account the present capability of the ground to absorb the rainfall, the road quickly becomes flooded in storms or badly frozen over, submerging our footway and threatening our properties. My concern is that building on BE041 in this regard would make matters far worse. Aspect Now I'm in my ninth decade I am enjoying my garden and its open views opposite. I have mature trees, views of fields to the horizon and plenty of clear sky's to enjoy. This precious commodity would sadly be lost should this development go ahead.	- Highway Authority have no objection in principle to the development of land for housing, subject to provision of adequate access, visibility, internal layout and design. - The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site has low to medium biodiversity value overall in terms of the area recommend trees and hedgerows are retain if the site is developed.
PO1632	Mr F Turner				Object	Brown Edge. In my opinion this land is not suitable for housing. Woodhouse lane is far too narrow. Vehicle approaching in opposite directions have to stop and either one or the other have to reverse back on to Sytch Road or overland Drive to pass each other. Some years ago when Mr	No sites are proposed on Woodhouse Lane Brown Edge

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Hargreaves was the owner of the farm and land of Woodhouse Lane he applied for planning permission for a dwelling on the same land, but it was refused, now you want to build houses on it and that will destroy this small piece of Green Countryside. I therefore object to houses being built on woodhouse lane brown edge.	
PO2047	C F Stanyer				Object	BE056	This site was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 but is not a proposed site in the Preferred Options consultation.
PO2048	Mrs C Stanyer				Object	BE056	See response to PO2047
PO2049	Mrs C Stanyer				Object	BE056	See response to PO2047
PO9540	Ms Kay Bartlam				Support	SITE BE032 - BROWN EDGE This site has better access to the main road than BE041 and does not cause drainage and transport problems. As this is on the outskirts of Brown Edge it does not affect so many existing homes.	A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO9574	Mrs Mavis Slack				Support	(Summary only - full comments attached) Support the non-inclusion of site BE056 in the Local Plan. Site would be unsuitable for development because: Woodhouse Lane is a country lane and already accommodates many farm tractors, trailers, lorries and milk tankers throughout the day. There is also a dangerous bend to negotiate. I consider site BE056 most unsuitable for building houses. Agree with the Council's assessment of the site (see attached document) and would like to add that there is no sewer or grids within Woodhouse Lane.	Support noted
PO1025 5	Mr P F Bannister				Support	BE032 (Options site) having been to the meetings surely land be032 would be a much better option as this is on a main road much wider than Willfield lane , good visibility both ways and as limited homes surrounding it i count 6 homes directly on the site compared to 35 plus on Willfield lane , and would certainly cause limited if any disruption	A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO1633	Mrs K Morris				Object	As residents of Willfield lane we would like to raise our concerns about the development plans. On hearing the plans for the building of 40 houses we are very concerned	Highway Authority have no objection in principle to the development of land for housing, subject to provision of adequate access, visibility, internal layout and design.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						as to the increased problems we envisage from this development. There have already been a number of accidents due to the narrowness of the lane especially as the speed limit is way too high. The last accident involved a family who's car overturned. The lane was blocked for several hours, luckily no one was killed. This problem will only get worse as the traffic along this lane is increased. Another concern is that the area is semi-rural and the area is farmed. Tractors use this lane to get to the fields in order to cut grass. Milk waggons also use this on occasions. Even with the modest number of vehicles this land gets blocked when other traffic is passing. This again will only get worse when the traffic is increased due to this new development. In this rural area horse riding is very popular. Willfield Lane is frequently used by youngsters from the stables near Stockton brook. This lane has a relatively smaller amount of traffic at the moments and used by this group of people use in the morning, evenings and at weekends. We can see that the problems with horse riders will be exacerbated by this proposed development. Along much length with Willfield Lane there are no footpaths; traffic has to slow down because of walkers. Also many residents use this way to walk to the local shops Both Brown Edge and Stockton Brook. Again more problems will ensure as traffic will be increased if this development goes ahead.	
PO1634	Mrs D Shufflebottom				General comment	I agree with your with you decision on BE056 The land into woodhouse has a blind bend that is why we have open fence grass verges. At last parish council meeting the grass verge and the lane become very busy with traffic resulting in the grass verge being damaged, which the parish council have concerns. Also we now have a large amount of horse rider, which are coming from fold farm.	• Comment noted
PO1635	Mr S Chadwick				General comment	I agree with the councils and support their decision on the site at brown edge woodhouse lane BE056. There is no street lighting in the length of the lane only 1 which is not the lane but off the road leading into the lane.	• Comment noted
PO1637	Mr A Shufflebotham				General comment	The road traffic has increased and at the last parish council meeting it was discussed that the grass verge had become damaged due to a large number of vehicles using the lane, which means the road is not suitable and the lane into large enough to take traffic. The entrance is to this site is not suitable enough and is dangerous in and out of BE056. I thank you and agree with all the discussions you have made	• Comment noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						towards BE056	
PO1636	Mrs A Chadwick				General comment	In woodhouse lane there are no sewers no grids. The level of land opposite is not suitable, this will take out the light in front of our property. The land floods in places and the land BE056 is flood soak. In woodhouse lane we agree that there are no sewers at all in the length of the road or grids. At the property next to us they have horses which use the lane in woodhouse lane; this is not going to be suitable for these riders. The exit which I not suitable for access in to BE056 is dangerous as well so I agree to decision about the exits there are more suitable areas available with in the area of Brown Edge. I thank you very much for your decision you have made and I agree with BE056	Comment noted
PO1025 2	Ms Debbie Evans				Object	I support the development of land off Breach Road, Brown Edge (BE032): It has only the amber and Willfield Lane (BE041) has green. After attending the meeting in May I realised how many people were against BE041 with many concerns about the very narrow road leading to Moss Hill, as I use this road every day I understand as sometimes it is almost impossible to get through reversing back many times for on coming traffic, more traffic would only make this situation even worse. We had an idea for the Council to help the community get more benefit from choosing site BE032, I propose. As I also own the 12.75 acres at the rear of BE032 (see attached map) I would be willing to give the council 2.75 acres adjoining BE032 for a sports ground (eg football pitch basketball netball courts) this would be safer away from busy roads. Also the other 10 acres (if required) could be purchased or rented by yourselves to include your community garden scheme (allotments) as this is a perfect position for this project having flat very fertile land that has been tended professionally for years, also the public footpath runs along the other side of the fence at the very top giving access from Broad Lane.	See response above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1617	Mr George Evanson				Object	CL004 This is to confirm my objection to this proposal for Caverswall and Cookshill: Because the only access from Roughcote Lane is totally unsuitable Access to the area from Cookshillm Green is totally unacceptable due to the narrow eroad, onstreet parking for residents and no pavements offereins safety for pedestrians The road junction by the Auctioneers Arms is already a hazardous traffic problem. The designated area should not be held in reserve as a possible area for future development of any kind.	This site was included in the Site Options consultation 2015 but is not a proposed site in the Preferred Options consultation.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO880	Ms Kim West				General comment	There were I think 4 potential sites being looked at in Checkley. Only two, CH07 and CH008 are covered in the site assessments. There is no reference to a site off the A522 opposite the New Broom (or close to that) and no reference to the land in the field adjacent to Church Street/ to the back of Cranberry Avenue. These areas do not show on the latest maps. Can someone confirm that this means that there are no areas for development now in Checkley? It will be good news if that is correct.	No residential sites are proposed in Checkley
PO433	Mr David John Allen				General comment	Checkley. Fole Dairy should be classified as a key development site utilising a brown field site which is rapidly becoming an eyesore. Hollington. Infill linear, stone construction (where appropriate) mix of affordable and desirable detached properties should be encouraged to support the working village , stone , farming , diversification of farming such as equestrian. JCB rat run traffic speed calming measures need to be included.	Comment noted
PO891	Ms Kim West				General comment	There were several sites being g considered for Checkley. There are only two site assessments in the documentation for CH007 and CH008. The site adjacent to Church Street and to the back of Cranberry Avenue is no longer showing on the map and there is no reference to this land in the site assessment. I hope, very much, this means that there is no longer any development being considered in the village.	See response to PO880
PO7317 PO7655 PO7781 PO7474 PO7400 PO7094 PO7239 PO8041 PO7496 PO7634 PO7484 PO7528 PO7524 PO7486 PO7543 PO7270	Mr I Malbon Mrs A Brown Mr Gordon Stone Mr David Ball Mr & Mrs Amos Mary Amos D.C. Carr Paige Sammons Ms Helen Chisholm Mr P G Shingler Mr T Griffiths Mrs Wendy Carr Ms Donna Talbot Mr Mark Middleton Pat Clews Ms Zoe Bloor				Object	Correspondence attached to covering letter from Checkley Village Awareness committee (and site objections) dated 12th April 2016. See representation ref: PO7093]. OBJECTION TO THE INCLUSION OF AN EXTENTION TO THE TEMPORARY (Due to expire 2017) TRAVELLER SITE AT FOUR TREES, UTTOXETER ROAD, CHECKLEY, ST10 4NA adjacent to Checkley Cricket Club & Rose cottage.	There is no proposal to extend the temporary traveller site at Checkley and no proposed residential sites.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7521	Mr Geoffrey Smith						
PO7537	Mr and Mrs J Richards						
PO7533	Mr Anthony Fuller						
PO7614	Ms Michaela Fuller						
PO7595	Mrs M Boucher						
PO7596	Mr Anthony Moulton						
PO7515	Mr and Mrs I Whieldon						
PO7271	Mr David Hoult						
PO7499	Mr Eric John Moss						
PO7493	Mr George Adams						
PO7508	Mrs M M Harrison						
PO7594	Ms Caroline Lawson						
PO7353	J A Best						
PO7591	Mr Nicholas Healy						
PO7590	Ms Jayne Healy						
PO7588	Mr John Vyse						
PO7475	Mr J C Coombs						
PO7479	Ms Victoria Bennett						
PO7489	Ms Helen Barber						
PO7642	Mr Ian Middleton						
PO7360	Mrs P Redfern						
PO7365	Mr T Birks						
PO7313	Mrs S Birks						
PO7312	Mr C Allcock						
PO7308	Mr R Lea						
PO7298	Miss H Davis						
PO7277	Mr J Smith						
PO7492	Mrs J Middleton						
PO7291	Mr George Pritchard						
PO7523	Mr Roger Smith						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7587	Mrs M Evans						
PO7593	J. Taylor						
PO7644	Ms Claire Taylor						
	Zahna Adrian						
PO7631	Martin						
PO7641	Mrs S Paulinski						
PO7320	Miss O Healy						
PO7319	Mr D Healy						
PO7643	Mr R Taylor						
PO7314	Mr P Gregory						
PO7311	Mr J Harvey						
PO7276	Mrs A Jackson						
PO7274	Mr J Middleton						
PO7273	Mrs S Seaman						
PO7488	Miss J Young						
PO7300	Mrs Olwyn Jones						
PO7303	Mr S Price						
PO7305	Mr S Bennett						
PO7316	Mr P Regan						
PO7318	Mr M Keeling						
PO7229	Mrs D Troy						
	Mr and Mrs J						
PO7612	Wood						
PO7600	R A Brewster						
PO7613	Mrs J H Mollart						
	Mr Stephen Paul						
PO7609	Brewster						
PO7603	C Finnegan						
PO7608	J Vazquez						
PO7602	J Flanagan						
PO7601	S Vazquez						
PO7598	Mrs S Alcock						
PO7597	Mr I C Brickles						
PO7668	Mrs A Taylor						
PO7391	M Kennedy						
	Ms Katie						
PO7652	Saunders						
PO7369	Ms Louize Cooke						
PO7615	S J Williams						
PO7616	Mr A Cowdell						
PO7617	Mrs L Blaize						
PO7620	Mr M Payne						
PO7621	Mr T Allen						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7622	Mr/s W Caddy						
PO7623	Ms A Dale						
PO7627	Mr B Dale						
PO7628	Miss E Titterton						
PO7629	Mr D Chandler						
PO7630	Mrs J Chandler						
PO7638	Mr P Chandler						
PO7373	Mr S Beardmore						
PO7382	Mr Steve Redfern						
PO7607	Mr Reginald Swift						
	Ms Elizabeth						
PO7610	Harper						
PO7605	Mr J. Cliffe						
PO7606	B Harper						
PO7611	P. Harper						
PO7637	Mr F. Buckley						
	Mr Nathan						
PO7599	Bromage						
	Mrs Jutta						
PO7215	Wheeldon						
PO7219	P Allen						
PO7224	Mr A.J. Elliott						
PO7257	Mrs J. Elliott						
	Mr Paul						
PO7267	Williamson						
	Ms Joanne						
PO7377	Woolliscroft						
PO7618	Mrs S Redfern						
	Mr Russell						
PO7648	Chidlow						
PO7626	M Jones						
PO7639	Mr F Dann						
PO7640	Mr A Saunders						
PO7307	Mr Peter Kelly						
PO7258	Miss S Wood						
PO7255	Mr J Turner						
	Mr & Mrs J & P						
PO7240	Williamson						
PO7372	Mrs M Paling						
PO7604	mr Max Furness						
	Mr Mark						
PO7396	Leedham						
	Mr Robert						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7387	Womersley						
PO7472	Miss Danica Rose						
	Brassington						
	Mrs Susan						
	Elizabeth						
PO7473	Womersley						
	Mr Marcus						
	Edward						
PO7633	Womersley						
PO7632	Mr Mark Ridgway						
PO7241	Mr R Cooper						
PO7619	Mr R Saunders						
PO7624	Mr D Chapman						
PO7625	Miss E Holmes						
PO7636	Mr D Holmes						
PO7254	Mr J Minshall						
PO7306	Mr Joshua Hewitt						
PO7649	Mr A Hulme						
	Mr and Mrs R						
PO7663	Jones						
	Mr Nigel Roy						
PO7659	Reade						
PO7645	Cass Graham						
PO7665	Mr J Tams						
	Mr and Mrs						
PO7675	Rommelrath						
	Ms Heather						
PO7673	Graham						
	Mrs P						
PO7592	Leatherbarrow						
PO7880	Mrs C Salt						
PO7719	Ms Kim West						
	Ms Cynthia						
PO7826	Brassington						
PO8520	Mrs C Moran						
PO7742	Mr C Walker						
	Mr Ronald Peter						
PO7771	Massey						
PO7851	Mr David Shooter						
PO7796	Ms Julia Coughlan						
PO7821	Mr B Walker						
PO8028	Mr Roy Walker						
PO7815	Ms Mavis Morton						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7991	Mr C N Gray						
PO7679	D Brown						
PO7707	S Homer						
PO7680	P W Alsopp						
	Mr & Mrs Eric and Doreen						
PO7678	Lomas						
	Mr Brian						
PO7681	Whitehead						
	Mr and Mrs B A						
PO7785	Prosser						
	Mr Michael						
PO7786	Shingler						
PO7677	Mrs S M Taylor						
	Tina and Terry						
PO7676	Bellamy						
PO8524	Mr Mick Roberts						
PO7664	Mrs D Brogarth						
	Mr Thomas						
PO7674	Barrows						
	Louise						
PO8616	Leatherbarrow						
	Mr and Mrs						
PO9586	Boorman						
PO9584	Mrs J M Morris						
	Mr and Mrs A						
PO9580	Carr						
PO7666	Mr T A Ketcher						
	Mr & Mrs A J						
PO7662	Hunt						
PO7661	Mr D Edwards						
PO7660	Miss V Wilkinson						
PO7658	Mr A Graham						
PO7871	Mr R Graham						
PO7789	Mr N Beaumont						
PO7656	Mrs J Chell						
PO9582	Mr N Jackson						
PO7672	Mr M Ratchford						
PO8023	Mr Mark Alford						
PO7667	Mrs S Gallimore						
	Mr Derek						
PO7669	Chesters						
PO7670	Mr Paul Rushton						

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7654	L Turner						
PO7646	Mr Joe Brown						
PO7881	Mrs Elaine Jones						
	Mrs Brenda Robotham						
PO7794	Ms Rosemarie Rushton						
PO8522	Thomas C. Kitt						
PO7671	Mr D.R. Hanlon						
PO7765	Mr Leigh Peach						
PO7725	Mr W Rommelrath						
PO7993	Mrs K Nash						
PO7792	Mr A Bartlam						
PO7992	Mrs J Cooke						
PO7790	Mr A Chandler						
PO7787	Mr S Ideson						
PO7793	Mr and Ms Anthony and Josephine Prince						
PO7795	Mr and Mrs M Jones						
PO7859	Mr Edward Byrne						
PO9578	Mr Daniel Curtis						
PO9585	Mr Christopher Allen						
PO9589	Ms P M Moss						
PO9576	Mr J Eaton						
PO9577	Ms Jackie Rushton						
PO7777	Ms Patricia Alcock						
PO7784	F.R. Nutt						
PO7734	Mr Clive Grainger						
PO7768	P J Thorley						
PO7750	Mr S T L Lowe						
PO7766	Mr Alex Thorley						
PO7758	Mrs P Oldroyd						
PO7647	Mr Raymond Sidney Jones						
PO7866	Mr S Wareham						
PO7791	Mrs J Smith						
PO7650	Miss V Beardmore						
PO9588							

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9581 PO7651 PO8523 PO7788 PO7657 PO8040 PO9587 PO7783 PO7861 PO8521 PO9590 PO7781 PO7653	Mr G Waldron Mr M Peach Ms Jean Smith Mr Michael Kelsall Miss S Beddow Mr M Brassington Mr & Mrs D & J Smith MR MARK RUSHTON Ms Jane Burns Mrs D Wathall Mr Clive Smith Mr N Clarke Mr Gordon Stone Mr Jason Clarke						
PO9547	Mr K Ede					Letter submitted [attached] clarifying that Mr Ede as landowner has no desire in releasing a plot of land in Checkley, as a permanent traveller site.	See comments above
PO7649	Mr and Mrs R Jones				Object	I am sorry but I am fully aware that people need somewhere to live. Questions what Council is trying to do. Checkley is a lovely village to live in. There is spare land "Fole Dairy" - it has obvious hardstanding - use that. Questions how we/our doctor's/our schools will cope. It is quite frightening. So much bad press - litter etc. We do not want this.	See response to PO7484
PO7663	Mr Nigel Roy Reade				Object	To close to existing development (Badgers Hollow). The village has no retail services to cope with extra intake. No suitable access to field to change this would cause considerable expense - question where would this come from. Visual impact of Green Belt land. Devaluation of present properties. Strongly object to this proposed development. Also object to the proposed development being hidden from the residence of Checkley.	See response to PO7484
PO7659	Cass Graham				Object	There have to be more appropriate sites in SMDC - you need to focus on removing unauthorised occupancy of existing site in 2017 + a considered extension is simply ridiculous.	See response to PO7484
PO7645	Mr J Tams				Object	We object to the site, this is green belt land. Not a camp for Travellers. They are also running a business from this site.	See response to PO7484
PO7665	Mr and Mrs Rommelrath				Object	I strenuously object to the inclusion of an extension to the temporary traveller site at Four Trees Uttoxeter Road. It is totally unacceptable to locate a larger traveller site in this location which is a special landscape area in the same way it	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						would be unacceptable to locate a commercial caravan leisure site. Totally out of context with the surrounding environment. Absurd.	
PO7675	Ms Heather Graham				Object	-the existing traveller site is TEMPORARY and existing travellers will be expected to move in 2017. It is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE that this site should even be considered in such circumstances. - I strenuously object to the existing occupation of the land at Four Trees by the travellers family and officers of the Council should be focussing on how to remove them - the very thought of an extension is completely ludicrous and makes all the actions and all the money spent in the last 9 years laughable. -it has been agreed that the location is inappropriate by a number of experts so this just is not an option.	• See response to PO7484
PO7673	Mrs P Leatherbarrow				Object	-no consultation -access no thanks	• See response to PO7484
PO7592	Mrs C Salt				Object	- Poor access to site on what is already a dangerous road. - Similar applications to SMDC have been refused. This should follow suit. -Access would be through a neighbour's land and on a dangerous bend.	• See response to PO7484
PO7880	Ms Kim West				Object	I object to the inclusion of an extension to the temporary traveller site at Four Trees, Checkley for the following reasons: it is inappropriate development of a "special landscape area" access is unsuitable utilities are insufficient development would have a detrimental impact on the area development is an extension of a temporary existing site so viability of existing smaller site is not yet satisfactorily agreed. I would like to add that i have previously supported the retrospective residential use of the existing site at Four Trees. When the land was bought i enquired about access to the fields behind Four Trees and was assured these would not be encroached upon or put up for development. I am disappointed that SMDC appear to be using the only temporarily authorised, use of Four Trees for residential use as a means of seeking to develop a much larger site. Checkley is a small village where the green fields aspect supports the historic and cultural value of the area as the primary parish village. The development of a significantly sized traveller site would be detrimental to the village. I can see no benefit in the development of such a site and the destruction of not only green fields but an area of "special landscape". I believe there must be far more suitable sites available elsewhere.	• See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7719	Ms Cynthia Brassington				Object	A traveller site at this location will spoil a beautiful village, especially as it is so near to our cricket club, a major village amenity. The club has already encountered trespass from a horse and dog from the private traveller site next to Rose Cottage. Strongly object.	See response to PO7484
PO7826	Mrs C Moran				Object	STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSED SITE. TRAVELLERS MOVING IN AND OUT OF THIS SMALL VILLAGE WOULD LEAVE DEVASTATION AND CHAOS. WE ARE VERY PROUD OF OUR VILLAGE AND WE DO NOT WANT THIS PROPOSED SITE . WE HAVE LEARNED FROM OUR LOCAL PAPER THAT LEEK AND BIDDULPH HAVE BEEN TAKEN OFF THE LIST BOTH PLACES SO MUCH BIGGER THAN OUR SMALL VILLAGE.	See response to PO7484
PO8520	Mr C Walker				Object	Checkley is an attractive well ordered village with an active village hall, school, cricket club and ancient church and surrounded by meadows and farmland. This 'suggested' development is strongly opposed and would be total anathema to the well being of Checkley. Any development of the traveller site would be inappropriate and insensitive and seriously affect the wellbeing of people and properties. The backdrop over the meadows from Badgers Hollow - to say nothing of Rose Cottage and others in the immediate vicinity plus the cricket club - would be an unregulated eyesore consisting of caravans, lorries, industrial waste and other detritus as so often happens with such sites. Property prices would, therefore, be considerably compromised. SMDC has a reputation of incompetence, indecision and poor planning control giving no notifications to residents, and should urgently address the existing problem of the travellers site instead of adding more issues and exacerbating the problem.	See response to PO7484
PO7742	Mr Ronald Peter Massey				Object	We strongly object to this development because it is not designated as residential use.	See response to PO7484
PO7771	Mr David Shooter				Object	WE STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE LACK OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION OVER THIS ISSUE. THE IMPACT OF AN EXTENSION TO THE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITE CAN ONLY BE EXPLAINED WITH FULL CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE SMDC AND LOCAL RESIDENTS.	See response to PO7484
PO7851	Ms Julia Coughlan				Object	I strongly object to this plan for many reasons. The current site is due to expire and to develop it further would cause issues with road safety, utilities, traffic. This area is supposed to be a "special landscape area" and as such should not be utilised in such a manner. As residents we have not been consulted for our thoughts and opinions on a proposed permanent travellers site.	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7796	Mr B Walker				Object	On two occasions last year meetings for local residents were held in Checkley regarding future proposed residential developments in the Checkley Lower Tean area, however at these meetings there was no information forthcoming regarding the extension of the traveller site at Four Trees Uttoxeter Road adjacent to Checkley Cricket Club and Rose Cottage. We would strongly object to the extension to this temporary site as listed in this communication, and further request information forwarding to us as to why we have had no communication from you of this proposal.	See response to PO7484
PO7821	Mr Roy Walker				Object	The existing site is temporary until 2017. Now Staffordshire Moorlands Council wish to extend this site for eight families. Totally against all the statements you have made in the past. This would be a blight on Checkley village and the surrounding area reflecting the value of all properties. All the objections on the attached are relevant and this proposal should not proceed.	See response to PO7484
PO8028	Ms Mavis Morton				Object	I strongly object to the proposed extended development of the existing traveller site mentioned above. I feel it would seriously affect our local community and be a drain on local services and amenities.	See response to PO7484
PO7815	Mr C N Gray				Object	We strongly object to proposed extension of the temporary travellers site as this will spill onto greenfield agricultural land, access to the proposed area will have to be through another landowner's property. There are lots of brownfield sites that can be better used for this need. It is likely that any site will become a long term home for travellers with large 'mobile' homes just being sited and creating a blot on the landscape. Once a green field site is used in this way even temporarily it will never be returned to its previous state.	See response to PO7484
PO7991	D Brown				Object	This clearly is not in the best interest of our village.	See response to PO7484
PO7679	S Homer				Object	No local consultations. Plan hidden from residents of Lower Tean and Checkley - dishonest. If current site is TEMPORARY question how can it be extended. The Plan is obviously to make it permanent and much bigger.	See response to PO7484
PO7707	P W Alsopp				Object	I wish to strongly protest against the proposed traveller site at Four Trees Checkley. My main objections are: a) access to and from A522 is already an accident black spot and with the obscured visibility would only make it worse. b) this is not within the local residents interest, resulting in a possible devaluation of existing properties. c) concerns over supply of electricity, sewage and drainage facilities to support such a	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						venture. d) the Council are elected to represent their constituents views and opinions and as such would expect them to vote against this proposal, reflecting their concerns.	
PO7680	Mr & Mrs Eric and Doreen Lomas				Object	We both strenuously object to such a development between Checkley and Lower Tean.	See response to PO7484
PO7678	Mr Brian Whitehead				Object	I strongly object to this development being included in the Local Plan.	See response to PO7484
PO7681	Mr and Mrs B A Prosser				Object	We strongly object to the travellers site being extended. We were led to believe the site as it is presently would remain, to accommodate no more than 3 caravans.	See response to PO7484
PO7785	Mr Michael Shingler				Object	I strongly object.	See response to PO7484
PO7786	Mrs S M Taylor				Object	I strongly object to this development being included in the local plan.	See response to PO7484
PO7677	Tina and Terry Bellamy				Object	We strongly object to any expansion of the traveller site as the site should never have been allowed in the first place. However as we live at the edge of Checkley we already have problems with the inadequate electricity supply as the power is often too low due to the additional development which has already taken place over the years in the village. We also expect the Council to act in our best interests as we elected them and already pay a high price in Council tax. The internet provision is also very poor well below what the Government claim we should be receiving.	See response to PO7484
PO7676	Mr Mick Roberts				Object	Apart from the obvious road safety aspect and the upset this project would cause to local residents an influx of probably one hundred plus people in a small village with no reason for it other than moving the problem the Council has to find the correct type of permanent site for the travellers. It appears that the travellers can set up sites in nice areas for very little or no outlay, whereas other residents have paid high prices to live in this area. I am totally opposed to any sites in our village. This is not a Council dump site.	See response to PO7484
PO8524	Mrs D Brogarth				Object	We vehemently object to the possibility that plans to include provision to extend the existing travellers' site at Four Trees, will be in the new Local Development Plan (to be voted by SMDC on 13th April 2016. Any proposed plans for a travellers' site in the middle of a rural community Checkley, Fole, Lower Tean, and Tean would be to the detriment of that community. It would be an anathema and would greatly disrupt the harmony of village life. A travellers' site too, would be alien to the landscape. Moreover, it would have a	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						considerable financial impact on residents of Checkley, Lower Tean, Tean and Fole. Property prices would suffer as a result of any proposal or resulting site. Property prices would tumble in the area and would not reflect market value. We have only just been notified of this vote on the LDP next week via village channels, rather than officials. We were under the impression that Council officials were voted in to represent the wishes of the community and are entrusted to keep them informed of anything that impacted on their community. Notwithstanding our comments above, we object to any proposal of a travellers' site on the points as follows: the site is immediately adjacent to Rose Cottage and Checkley Cricket Club and is "back development" and not "infill" between residential developments. It would be on land that is classified as a "special landscape area". Access to this "land locked" site is limited and would be via an "Agricultural Easement" across land owned by an adjacent neighbour, who is unlikely to allow access. SMDC have refused planning permission for this type of development. The "private" traveller site has been refused planning. there has been no local consultation for a permanent travellers' site or suitable locations. access to the site is on a bend and is on an accident blackspot. existing electricity supply would not support demands of the site. connection to mains drainage would require access across adjacent landowners.	
PO7093	Ms Heather Graham	Checkley Village Awareness Committee			Object	Covering letter and attached comments submitted, that object to potential expansion to existing temporary traveller site adjacent to Rose Cottage, Uttoxeter Road, Checkley, ST10 4NA. [Refer to attached file].	See response to PO7484
PO7664	Mr Thomas Barrows				Object	To close to existing development (Badgers Hollow). The village has no retail services to cope with extra intake. No suitable access to field to change this would cause considerable expense - question where would this come from. Visual impact of Green Belt land. Devaluation of present properties. Strongly object to this proposed development. Also object to the proposed development being hidden from the residence of Checkley.	See response to PO7484
PO7674	Louise Leatherbarrow				Object	-SMDC have previously refused planning for this type of development. Existing traveller site is subject of temporary planning. -'back development' NOT 'infill' - questions is this not special landscape area. -There has been NO consultation	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						for permanent traveller sites. -Access is on a bend/accident black spot. -SMDC will have a lot of explaining to do after a well publicised objection to the travellers site.	
PO8616	Mr and Mrs Boorman				Object	STRONGLY OBJECT to an extension of this site and any proposed site at Checkley now or any time in the future. Checkley is too small to accommodate any more residents, buildings, it will affect schools, doctors, increase traffic on an already busy road. Question why would any 'true' "traveller" want to be on a permanent site. Question why should one group of people be 'given' a permanent place of residence - when [others] have to provide for [themselves].	See response to PO7484
PO9586	Mrs J M Morris				Object	I object strongly to this proposal. The existing illegal site has been of great concern for the past 8 years. It has gradually accommodated more caravans, cars, vans and even a brick residential building , all without proper planning permission...[some text redacted]. We have been assured many times over the years that the site would be closed, but it is still there, and the prospect of an even bigger site is completely unacceptable on land so close to two quiet villages in a special landscape area. ...[some text redacted].	See response to PO7484
PO9584	Mr and Mrs A Carr				Object	REASONS WHY THIS SITE IS UNSUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT: This falls adjacent to the existing cricket club which has been established since 1860. The amount of cricket that is now played at this scenic ground exceeds 100+ games a year, to which 60% of those games involve children from 6-17 year olds... The cricket club provides fantastic facilities for the local community..[some text redacted].	See response to PO7484
PO9580	Mr T A Ketcher				Object	We strongly object to this development, as..it will decrease the value of our house.. We have worked hard to afford to be able to live in a village and not be surrounded by noise..despite what the 'do gooders' say!	
PO9566	Ms Heather Graham	Checkley Village Awareness Committee			Object	Letter from Heather Graham to Simon Baker [attached], which attached correspondence between herself [Chair of CVAC] to Vice Chairman of Local Plan Steering group on 02/04/16.	See response to PO7484
PO7666	Mr & Mrs A J Hunt				Object	Special landscape area.	See response to PO7484
PO7662	Mr D Edwards				Object	Lack of infrastructure to support more population.	See response to PO7484
PO7661	Miss V Wilkinson				Object	I strongly object to this plan as there is not the infrastructure in the village to support such a development. In addition to	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						this Uttoxeter Road is already an accident blackspot and would struggle to cope with the extra traffic (combined with JCB works traffic and the continuing development of Uttoxeter). The area is also subject to a special landscape area and more development would have an impact on this as well as tourism to the local area.	
PO7660	Mr A Graham				Object	I strongly object to the extension of the present unauthorised site adjacent to Rose Cottage and cricket clubground for the following:- a) the land of the current temporary and the possible extension are both in the special landscape area and therefore i agree that as per the current Local Plan there would be a presumption against ANY type of development. b) the August 2015 PPTS specifically states in para 4(d) that planmaking should protect the green belt from inappropriate development. Para 3 requires the RESPECT of the settled community para (4) protect local amenity and environment. Policy E 16&17 specifically 'protect' the greenbelt from traveller development ie the proposed is not aligned with the requirements of the PPTS August 2015. c) there is no access from the A522. d) drainage and power supply do not exist.	See response to PO7484
PO7658	Mr R Graham				Object	-Completely inappropriate -unauthorised occupation by travellers already. -extension not an option - vacation of existing site is the only option.	See response to PO7484
PO7871	Mr N Beaumont				Object	This type of development is totally unsuitable for this area. It is unwanted by a large majority of existing residents. It is in a dangerous position for vehicles, entering or leaving the site. It will be extremely detrimental to the local area and will reduce the value of local properties. It will considerably reduce the desirability of the village as a good place to live and bring up a family, or retire after a lifetime of hard work.	See response to PO7484
PO7789	Mrs J Chell				Object	On safety grounds alone this appears to be a silly plan. Traveller communities tend to have many young children, and the Uttoxeter Road so close by can only be considered an "accident waiting to happen"	See response to PO7484
PO7656	Mr N Jackson				Object	TOTALLY UNSUITABLE SITE FOR ALL THE REASONS THE COUNCIL HAVE ONLY GIVEN TEMPORARY PLANNING TO THE GYPSIES ALREADY AT THE SITE. PLANNING SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN GRANTED IN THE FIRST PLACE. IF IT IS NOT SUITABLE FOR A HOUSE PLOT THEN IT CAN NEVER BE SUITABLE AS A GYPSY SITE.	See response to PO7484
PO9582	Mr M Ratchford				Object	the existing Traveller site is 'temporary' and is clearly unsuitable for such developments . There are already numerous expansions and developments planned for the	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						local area, surprising given that it is a 'Specialist Landscape Area' at a time of austerity question if it would be the taxpayer who fund site affordable homes are needed for local residents and their children The land is not easily accessed and is 'land locked' The existing temporary site has been refused . the land is blocked by electrical and agricultural means - in addition to drainage issues The road is an accident blackspot , hence the existing safety cameras and regular police presence.	
PO7672	Mr Mark Alford				Object	IF THE BLYTHE BRIDGE SITE (TR002) IS NOT APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL, WE OBJECT TO THE CHECKLEY SITE (TR005) AS IT WOULD BE UNSUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN AN ISOLATED LOCATION COMPARATIVELY.	See response to PO7484
PO8023	Mrs S Gallimore				Object	I strongly object to a travellers site between Checkley - Lower Tean. SMDC needs to look at itself and understand it is the public who vote them into office. The small traveller site at Four Trees should not have been allowed to happen. There are specific planning reasons and technical reasons why the site is unsuitable for this development and further larger travellers site should not even be being considered.	See response to PO7484
PO7667	Mr Derek Chesters				Object	We are in full agreement with the comments and contents of the enclosed form concerning a Local Development Plan for the residents of Checkley, Lower Tean, Fole and Tean residents. We strongly object to a travellers site being proposed at Checkley.	See response to PO7484
PO7669	Mr Paul Rushton				Object	NO LOCAL CONSULTATION GIVEN CREATING MISTRUST. ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT.	See response to PO7484
PO7670	L Turner				Object	A traveller site would also exacerbate the flood problems in the Lower Tean area.	See response to PO7484
PO7654	Mr Joe Brown				Object	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS DEVELOPMENT. -POOR VISIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE/EXIT FOR LARGE VEHICLES. -SMDC HAVE PREVIOUSLY REFUSED PERMISSION FOR SIMILAR SITES. -EXISTING PRIVATE SITE ONLY HAS TEMP AGREEMENT.	See response to PO7484
PO7646	Mrs Elaine Jones				Object	There must be some brown sites more suitable to green fields in a special landscape area. Questions who will monitor/clear any debris left behind. Will it be taxpayer. This development would also decrease property prices in the area.	See response to PO7484
PO7881	Mrs Brenda Robotham				Object	This has been strenuously opposed by both residents and SMDC. The reasoning behind the opposition is clear, the present site at Four Trees cannot accommodate the present family due to it being totally inappropriate for a traveller site. The site is on a bend on a very busy road, when the A50 is	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						closed due to an accident traffic is diverted passed this site and all residential areas from Draycott to Uttoxeter. The schools in the area cannot cope with the present amount of pupils question how can they cope with a substantial site, this is also true for doctors, dentists etc. The present site constitutes "back development" and only has temporary planning permission until 2017 so question how can planning permission suddenly be granted for a considerably extended traveller site. The present site is bordered by a cricket club and residential dwellings, once again not suitable for a large traveller site. It would be appalling if further temporary planning permission is extended at Four Trees in 2017 as there are perfectly adequate traveller sites in both Sudbury and Stoke on Trent.	
PO7794	Ms Rosemarie Rushton				Object	Outdated and underhand politics once again. Residents have a right to know what is being proposed in their area and the people who get the privilege to serve them as councillors owe it to them to be honest fair and transparent. I wholeheartedly object to this plan. Let Leek or Biddulph take something for a change.	See response to PO7484
PO8522	Thomas C. Kitt				Object	I strongly object to so called (temporary) site. Uttoxeter Road is already returning to the volume of traffic pre- A50 bypass days plus the possibility of fly tipping puts more cost for the Council. I wouldn't like to see a temporary site grow to DALE FARM size.	See response to PO7484
PO7671	Mr D.R. Hanlon				Object	I strongly object to the extension of the site and am appalled that the temporary allowance was granted which effectively allows riding roughshod over the planning application process.	See response to PO7484
PO7765	Mr Leigh Peach				Object	Strongly object!	See response to PO7484
PO7784	F.R. Nutt				Object	I very strongly object to the extension of the traveller site at Four Trees.	See response to PO7484
PO7777	Ms Patricia Alcock				Object	I OBJECT TO ANY FURTHER EXTENSION. THIS HAS GONE ON LONG ENOUGH. IT IS NOT AN AREA TO HAVE A TRAVELLERS SITE ON. THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL VILLAGE WITH PROPERTIES AND A WONDERFUL CRICKET CLUB THAT REFLECT THIS, AND YOU WANT TO SPOIL THIS WITH A CARAVAN PARK, WHERE IS ALL THIS GOING TO END.	See response to PO7484
PO7734	Mr Clive Grainger				Object	Totally inappropriate site for many reasons. Mainly access onto A522 there has been fatalities on this bend in the past.	See response to PO7484
PO7768	P J Thorley				Object	Our objection is due to the reasons stated and surely the travellers would prefer a more rural site.	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO7750	Mr S T L Lowe				Object	The consequences of the above plan to go through planning, could be a total disaster. Increased risks, boundary protection, litigation, but most of all, what is most at risk. The beginning of the end, of over 150 YEARS provision of cricket played at 4 Trees. I could go on 80-100 junior members alone present on a Friday evenings with parents. It is for one reason, alone, that mentioned above we most strongly object to this development.	See response to PO7484
PO7766	Mr Alex Thorley				Object	-Impact on landscape -increased traffic -land access We strongly object to this development being included in the local development plan. Same reasons given above.	See response to PO7484
PO7758	Mrs P Oldroyd				Object	I agree with all comments as listed. Also question why has this been put forward so quickly and without any consultation with local residents and our local parish council. I strongly object to these proposals. Checkley is not in any way suitable for a traveller site.	See response to PO7484
PO7647	Mr Raymond Sidney Jones				Object	There must be some brown sites more suitable to green fields in a special landscape area. Questions who will monitor/clear any debris left behind. Will it be taxpayer. This development would also decrease property prices in the area.	See response to PO7484
PO7725	Mr W Rommelrath				Object	I strongly object to any development on land adjacent to Rose Cottage and Checkley Cricket Club. This is arable land and should remain as.	See response to PO7484
PO7993	Mrs K Nash				Object	I wish to strongly object to the proposed and existing travellers sites. The existing site has had numerous extensions of evictions and i feel it's about time this was enforced. There is no reason they should not be removed from this site. There should not be one rule for [travellers] and another for the rest of the community. There are numerous reasons this site is unsuitable including access, site of beauty, lack of available amenities and many more.	See response to PO7484
PO7792	Mr A Bartlam				Object	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE EXTENSION OF THE TRAVELLER SITE AT FOUR TREES. THE SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA SHOULD BE JUST FOR THAT PURPOSE ONLY. THERE ARE PLENTY OF BROWNFIELD SITES THAT COULD BE CONVERTED MORE EASILY.	See response to PO7484
PO7992	Mrs J Cooke				Object	When the original unauthorised development was set up at Four Trees most of the residents were horrified. Most were too polite to voice their opinion. We strongly feel that the original and blatant breach of planning laws should be dealt with. If the planning committee don't take action and then allow more caravans onto the site it will send out the	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						message to all the travelling community to set up unauthorised sites within the Moorlands. Your actions now could set the tone for the future.	
PO7790	Mr A Chandler				Object	I strongly object to this development.	See response to PO7484
PO7787	Mr S Ideson				Object	OBJECT TO ANY EXTENSION TO THE PRESENT SITE AT FOUR TREES.	See response to PO7484
PO7793	Mr and Ms Anthony and Josephine Prince				Object	POOR ACCESS, AGAINST PLANNING DIRECTIVES, NO AMENITIES.	See response to PO7484
PO7795	Mr and Mrs M Jones				Object	For the reasons given, plus one dog running round worrying people is enough we don't want anymore. This is a lovely place to live please don't spoil it.	See response to PO7484
PO7859	Mr Edward Byrne				Object	I strongly object to the proposed extension development. The site proposed is surely against the policy of the current Local Plan and previous planning policy. Clearly there are access issues to this development and SMDC have refused planning permission for this type of development previously. Myself and local residents will continue to object to any development of this site now and in future.	See response to PO7484
PO9578	Mr Daniel Curtis				Object	I object to the proposal for an additional travellers site located at Four Trees. previous applications have all been refused, and the existing single family are only on a temporary licence. There is poor access and visibility at a possible junction with the main road. It is a greenfield site that would extend the village. The small village of Lower Tean could not cope with the integration of a large number of travellers. For this reason I also object. Surely a site with more local services nearby (near a larger settlement) would be preferable.	See response to PO7484
PO9585	Mr Christopher Allen				Object	Question why we have not used the old COOP site to relocate the travellers...If I had brought that land and put a brick rest area on it the Council would have made me take it down, two sets of rules one for travellers and one for [others]. Not right in any shape or form. [some text redacted].	See response to PO7484
PO9589	Ms P M Moss				Object	I wish to object to the idea of an extended travellers site at Four Trees. This is a shocking proposal as the existing travellers site is supposed to be a temporary arrangement, and they should..be moving off next year for all the right reasons previously listed. This special landscape area would be totally spoilt and from a practical point, local services are not readily available, and many problems would ensue. The road is very busy and would be a hazard. Question why are	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						you possibly considering this when the general public are not allowed to have new residential properties in this area - surely not one law for some...[text redacted].	
PO9576	Mr J Eaton				Object	Firstly I don't understand the need for "permanent" traveller sites. I don't agree with them full stop. Question why a quiet..Parish such as Checkley being a suitable location. Whoever comes up with such plans must be from a different planet than the rest of us. We would anticipate. Our local village facilities ie community centre, local pubs, to be adversely affected not to mention our fantastic primary school. Our house values could be affected. I have lived here all my life (47 years). I never thought I would contemplate moving - until now.	See response to PO7484
PO9577	Ms Jackie Rushton				Object	Unsuitable location, back development. Land is Special Landscape Area. Existing site is already subject to large local opposition, so in which world does it become a good idea to extend the gypsy site. I also have extensive experience with travellers, and have a little more insight into what happens at gypsy sites...Very few of the site proposed are actually suitable.	See response to PO7484
PO9781	P J Thorley				Object	(From Councillor John Jones' Survey refer to PO8995) Plan C – All infill sites (maximum of 10-12 units per site) spread more widely around the village (likely to interest local and self builders).	See table on Biddulph Moor
PO7866	Mr S Wareham				Object	We most strongly object to the above proposal. Residents have been assured that the current site would not be included in further plans, for the extension of the site. No consultation has taken place regarding a permanent site or suitable location: the proposal has been hidden from view. Several factors indicate that any extension is inappropriate - ie the site is immediately adjacent to Rose Cottage and Checkley cricket club and is a back development not infill. Adequate vision to the busy A522 is insufficient. It is on a bend and an accident blackspot indicated by frequent monitoring by safety cameras. Electricity and drainage would be inadequate due to age. We reiterate our most strong objections to this proposal.	See response to PO7484
PO7791	Mrs J Smith				Object	I strongly object to the temporary traveller site at Four Trees, Checkley - and certainly do NOT think it is appropriate to the inclusion of an extension to that site. The residents in and around Checkley have opposed this traveller site and will continue to object to any further development.	See response to PO7484
PO7650	Miss V				Object	1. The land of the temporary traveller site is a 'special	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
	Beardmore					landscape area' and should be restored to this in 2017. 2. Access to the proposed site would be difficult at least, or dangerous, on the stretch of road it is on. 3. The cricket club has tried to buy extra land next to the cricket club but has been refused, so question why this land should be made available for a traveller site, which is more intrusive and out of character for the area.	
PO9588	Mr G Waldron				Object	i thin it will lower house prices [text redacted] [text redacted] litter and detritus the site that they are on now, always has more than one caravan on site question who gave permission to put in mains water and a dropped kerb question if the planning laws for travellers are different to other residents.	See response to PO7484
PO9581	Mr M Peach				Object	traffic is bad as it is on the roads the limits are not stuck to having a traveller site would also cause..rubbish and litter everywhere.	See response to PO7484
PO7651	Ms Jean Smith				Object	The towns of Tean, Checkley and Cheadle already suffer from the worst traffic flow imaginable as one parked car causes mayhem already. Access and egress from this site cannot be considered appropriate, especially for the vehicles in question and the site is already too close to local residences.	See response to PO7484
PO8523	Mr Michael Kelsall				Object	Object to the extension of a traveller site at Four Trees. Objected to the original site - which was illegally occupied, and has a permanent building erected - again illegally. Feel this site is unsuitable - due to access, drainage and services problems. Also concerned about the effect on property prices.	See response to PO7484
PO7788	Miss S Beddow				Object	As a spectator at Checkley Cricket Club, I feel this would spoil the view of the club. Also it would spoil the village and also spectacular views of the village. In earnest it would be detrimental to the village in every way.	See response to PO7484
PO7657	Mr M Brassington				Object	TO NEAR THE OLD A50.	See response to PO7484
PO8040	Mr & Mrs D & J Smith				Object	The existing illegal travellers' site breaches planning law and retrospective planning permission has been refused on more than one occasion. In a democracy, the law applies equally to everyone and counsellors have a clear duty to ensure that it does .	See response to PO7484
PO9565	Ms Morgan-Rimes	Checkley Parish Council			General comment	Letter from Checkley PC [attached], attaching letter from landowner, regarding availability of a site at Checkley for use as a travellers site.	See response to PO7484
PO9587	MR MARK RUSHTON				Object	Unsuitable location... ...Existing site is due for review in 2017, renewing it, or extending it makes a mockery of planning law.	See response to PO7484
PO7783	Ms Jane Burns				Object	I object to the proposed traveller site in Checkley as i feel it	See response to PO7484

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						will add to the traffic in the area and there is a lack of availability of school places in the local area. Checkley is a beautiful village with lovely scenery plants and wildlife. The traveller site will spoil the character of the village and spoil the scenery.	
PO7861	Mrs D Wathall				Object	We wish to strenuously object to the strong possibility that SMDC will be required to include an extended traveller site at Four Trees Checkley. Since 2008, whilst not in agreement with the unauthorised occupation at Four Trees of a small group of travellers, it must be noted that they have been good neighbours. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about a large extension. The proposed site is totally unsuitable to an extension.	See response to PO7484
PO8521	Mr Clive Smith				Object	Once again Lower Tean and Checkley are the target for outrageous development. The Council don't appear to care about the environment, and are completely devious . We are the 'dumping ground' for plans rejected by other areas. DOES ANYONE CARE ABOUT THIS AREA OF NATURAL BEAUTY.	See response to PO7484
PO7635	Mr M Allen				Object	Correspondence attached to covering letter from Checkley Village Awareness committee (and site objections) dated 12th April 2016. See representation ref: PO7093]. OBJECTION TO THE INCLUSION OF AN EXTENTION TO THE TEMPORARY (Due to expire 2017) TRAVELLER SITE AT FOUR TREES, UTTOXETER	See response to PO7484
PO9590	Mr N Clarke				Object	These travellers "played the system" by moving onto land they bought and then applying for retrospective planning permission. Breaking the spirit of the planning permission laws like this should not be rewarded by their occupancy being allowed to be extended. a travellers' site does not fit in with the character of the housing nearby and other sites could be found (eg a quarry that's now closed, say in nearby woodlands - other caravan sites find this very acceptable). Their being allowed an extension would create a precedent for others to move onto land or build on land and then apply for retrospective planning permission in the expectation of also being allowed to carry on legally despite initially acting illegally.	See response to PO7484

Also received petition of 222 signatures against traveller's site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO4502	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			CD002	Support	Allocations CD002 and CD003 are supported [for the reasons set out in greater detail in the attachments to Question 1 response].	Comment noted
PO1467	Mrs D Bullock				CD002	Object	Before listing my objections to area CD003 and CD002 in cheddleton staffs being passed of the building of 92 houses. I would question how anyone based in Glossop Derbyshire with a Stockport Postcode can know much about Cheddleton Staffs, with regard to building houses there why can't local councillors have control over this, and they know the area well to make the correct decisions. Objections On a number of occasions Planning has been applied for on sites CD002 and CD003 and been refused. In 1978 planning permission was refused. In 1978 planning permission was refused on the grounds of: Green Belt, traffic, and drainage problems on the site with the system. How has this situation changed in 2016 Green Belt still exists, with even make reason to preserve for the future generations. Traffic Since 1978 the traffic situation on the main road must have increased 20x + all the extra cars from the hospital site Basford Bridge Lane est and Leek brook estate all built in 1978. Drainage – No change in this situation either still the same problem as in 1978 so how can a site CD002 and CD003 suddenly become so acceptable in 2016. For example the traffic situation today 6/5/16. Tarmacking was taking place at Leek brook on the main road at 1.30pm the queue of traffic from Leek were back to the Britannia roundabout back to station road – a quiet time of the day imagine another 92 houses coming onto this road each day which is known as Williamsons Hollow a very dangerous spot to emerge onto main road where the speed limit is 50mph. The other entrance onto Folly Lane please note 'lane' with passing places totally unsuitable. Cars parked on the lane at all times from the houses. As CD003 and CD002 would connect to the boundary with Wetley Rocks village, this boundary defines the 2 villages so does this mean the 2 villages would then become 1, and if 3 in 10 houses would be started home with no doubt children, they would have to be driven to school as no schools are within walking distance. Surely the sensible thing to do in this situation would be spread the building of 92 houses over a few smaller areas more within the Cheddleton brown field sites – Leek brook est on a factory site. Why can this site be considered and keep the Green Belt sites safe for the future. Common sense should surely prevent and this important matter	- The decisions on the Local Plan will be made by Staffordshire Moorlands District Councillors before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for Examination. - Previous applications were refused under existing planning policy the proposed Local Plan will replace existing policy and seeks to allocate housing sites to meet objectively assessed need of the District. As a part of this process the existing Green Belt boundaries are being looked at. - The Highways Authority advises that development acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays. But preferable for CD002 to be developed in conjunction with CD003, with bulk of access through CD003. - The land in question is within the Green Belt The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. It found the site's overall impact on Green Belt's purposes were moderate <i>"Despite being a relatively large edge-of-settlement site, development would not intrude into open countryside, being contained physically and visually by a drain and hedgerow between Folly Lane and the A520 Cheadle Road"</i> and recommended the site could be consider for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
								the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field options have been proposed .Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO2366 PO2355	Mr Roger Hampson Ms J Pegg				CD002	Object	I strongly object to CD002s inclusion in the local plan preferred options sites and boundary maps. I fully understand the need to develop a local plane however by including this site the SMDC has ignored. 1) Safety concerns relating to the A520 2) The requirements of the town and country planning regulation's 3) The views of the parish council 4) The views of the people living in Cheddleton. 5) The government policy to protect the green belt land 6) The lack of infrastructure, including schools and medical services 7) The spirit of the location act 2011 To expand. 1) The site is designated in green belt 2) This site doesn't align with the National Planning Policy Framework regarding Green Belt. This proposed will effectively join Cheddleton to Wetley Rocks and encroaches onto the countryside. Site CD002 and CD003 provide the only green space between the 2 villages. 3) This site does not meet the sustainability objectives as detailed in the national planning policy framework. 4) No consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from this site by foot or cycle. 5) Site has an infrequent bus service to the other parts of North Staffs 6) The A520 between Ostlers Lane Wetley Rocks has significant History of road accidents. On the data shows that there have been 22 accidents between 2005 and 2013, despite the installation of Cameras inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 7) The pavement on the A520 is narrow (less than 1m) and on 1 side only. Cars travel legally at 50 mph and it is considered that this does not form a safe walking route for those accessing it. Such as schools etc. in the village centre. 8) The junction off Folly Lane and Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 9) The site is 1.6 miles away from the catchment Primary schools. Given the lack of provisions for pedestrians, cycles and the infrequent bus service, the obvious method of accessing the schools and increase the Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 10) Schools in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in population and are currently full or have a small number of vacant places. This proposed residential development would require significant investment to address this issue. I addition further buses would be required to transport 5 to 13 pupils to Leek as there is no provision in the village. 11) It is considered that the existing utilities	- See response to PO1467 regarding highways & Green Belt - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that "The site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area. However, the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance." - The Core Strategy defines Cheddleton as a

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							in this area could not sustain an increase in demand significant investment. This has not been considered. 12) Site has no substantial access to GP surgery. 13) It is known that the developer has attempted to coerce the Parish Council/SMDC for over approximately 20 years to support the release this site from Green Belt. Every attempt has previously been blocked by the parish council and residents of Cheddleton. This demonstrates the strength of feeling 14) Site has numerous trees that are known habitat wildlife, including a known bat population.	larger village with a range of facilities and services
PO109	Dr Alan Jones				CD002	Object	Density of dwellings is greater than in adjacent areas. Loss of open space on approach from south will lead to a loss of distinction between Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks. Access to A520 in a dangerous position on 50mph road.	- Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area consideration will be given to the scale of development and its impact on the surrounding area. - See response to PO1467 regarding the Green Belt - The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations The Study found “<i>Site is of medium landscape sensitivity. Site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include phased development (ensuring site is developed in combination with CD003).</i>”
PO299	Ms Julie Brownhill				CD002	Object	Development of this site will join together the villages of Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks. The access onto the A520 is poorly located and is in a 50mph area. There has been no consideration given to the lack of infrastructure such as doctors and dentists and no consideration given to the provision of school places. The distance from Cheddleton village centre will result in more car journeys with the resultant increase in pollution. There will be loss of amenity to surrounding properties. The views of the Parish Council and residents have been ignored by the District Council.	- See response to PO1467 regarding the Green Belt - See response to PO2366 regarding infrastructure - Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application - The views of residents and the Parish Council have been sought through the consultations. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.
PO3898	Mrs G & M Pyatt				CD002	Object	Exceptionally busy road, A520 which would access these sites. 96 Houses could mean another 150-200 extra cars using this road. It would mean that Cheddleton + Wetley Rocks would be joined	- See response to PO1467 regarding highways and Green Belt - See response to PO2366 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							together so no green space or area in-between. Lack of infrastructure i.e.: schools + medical services – both overloaded now. This land is in the Green Belt + provides habitat for wildlife. There are already lots of houses for sale in this area (see Leek Post and Times) which are not selling, so why do we need more.	infrastructure and wildlife The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change
PO3883	J.E. Keeling				CD002	Object	Hope me writing to you the 3 rd time is lucky. This is another objection to site: CD003 and CD002. Both lie in the green belt and in the past have been rejected twice as on unsuitable site for development it would go against the principle of greenbelt policy in joining the village of Cheddleton/Wetley rocks we would like to keep our villages separate – please – We have a unique identity in Staffordshire Moorlands and wish to retain it. It would create major road issues and road issues and other problems. 2 other site which residents and the parish council are in favour off is: CD115 in the centre of the village Staffordshire Farmers site which is a Brownfield Site. Please if possible when all parties meet to discuss our needs as well as finding a alternative site more suitable for development, I ask fir site CD003/CD002 to be removed from your plans.	See response to PO1467 regarding Green Belt, brownfield sites highways and previous application refusal
PO2030	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			CD002	Object	Site CD002 shown on the map and listed as land South of Rockend Drive/Millstone Edge, Cheddleton..... and Site CD003 shown on the map and listed as land West and South of 70-82 Folly Lane, Cheddleton. Both sites lie within the Green Belt and outside the village boundary. The Council strongly objects to the inclusion of both areas of land for development given that it would effectively link two villages and there would be major road/highway issues. As stated above, both sites lie within the Green Belt and outside the village boundary and any development of the site would degrade the natural gateway to the village of Wetley Rocks, which enhances the individuality of the village and contributes positively to the feeling of leaving or entering a place. If allocated it would go against two major principles of the Green Belt Policy. It would go against a major coalescent – the joining of two communities and the Council must ask for these two areas of land to be removed.	See response to PO1467 regarding Green Belt and highways
PO9557	Mr C J Coates				CD002	Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sited CD002 + CD003: Does not meet with Government Policy [in Green Belt and agricultural land] and requires change of village boundary [incorporate part of Wetley Rocks] A520 trunk road is not fit for purpose [already traffic accidents]. Addition of large number of heavy vehicles is overwhelming. site entrance at confluence of two opposing hills. Vehicles exceed speed limit [exceeds 80 decibels noise]. Health and safety an issue. Foot and	- See response to PO1467 regarding Green Belt and highways - See response to PO2366 regarding infrastructure and wildlife - See response to PO3898 regarding the need for houses - An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							cycle access to local amenities requires crossing this road. narrow pavement, large passing vehicles. question the capability of the public utilities/services in the area; they are at their capacity limit. Significant major improvements required. site has many ancient trees and hedgerows. Many trees need TPO status as they had significant interest. Therefore site requires ecological survey, in public domain, prior to development. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [historic appeal failed on these very grounds]. Core Strategy states that need to ensure any access routes to/from Churnet Valley should be maintained with attractive vistas. A520 is example of this. development would mean 132 houses in total will all need to access via Rock End Drive/A520. Folly Lane is narrow with major problems without major improvements. Without a Folly Lane access, any obstruction to Rock End access would isolate site from emergency vehicles. Primary school at Wetley Rocks (that children of site would attend) has dangerous junction of Mill Lane/A520 (HGVs mount narrow pavement). Would be exacerbated by on street parking at school. Properties in SMD/around CD002/CD003 hard to sell. There are thousands of empty properties in area. Therefore need for greenfield development not demonstrated, given brownfield sites could meet need. Equivalent employment prospects are not available, will lead to further commuting. Therefore need for properties in local area has not be shown. Lack of local employment prospects will lead to further commuting. 2012 Pointons consent had condition requiring applicant to coppice adjacent Staffordshire Farmers site. This was withdrawn as a Local Plan site option on the basis that many HGVs use A520 there. Argues that CD003 junction only 500m away, has similar characteristics, therefore both sites should be given equal consideration. Options sites CD015/030/008 would only require minor/no amendment to Green Belt, they are continuation of development area and will require no encroachment into Wetley Rocks.	carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/polices to meet this need.
PO9550	Mr J B Williams				CD002	Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to both Preferred Options site CD002 and CD003: only access road to CD003 is totally inadequate. Major improvements required site entrance at confluence of two opposing hills. Vehicles exceed speed limit, many accidents have happened in this area. Foot and cycle access to local amenities requires crossing this road. narrow pavement, large passing vehicles. Need prior independent investigation [fatal traffic injuries] before further development. if future development incorporated Rock End Drive/A520, this would be ludicrous accident hotspot. Question why these sites being considered given they are Green Belt. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [1970s appeal failed on these very grounds]. site has many ancient trees and hedgerows. Many trees need TPO status as they had significant interest. Consideration of landscape must be a paramount consideration [from Core Strategy]. Also need to ensure access routes to/from	• See response to PO1467 regarding Green Belt , brownfield land and highways • See response to PO9557 regarding trees and employment • See response to PO109 regarding landscape • See response to PO2366 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Churnet Valley should be maintained with attractive vistas. Council ignoring own policy. Development of 96 dwellings will result in grave infrastructure problems - local services will not cope. Local schools are near capacity, and access on foot to these dangerous. Sewage system, doctors, dentist, local electricity supply etc already over capacity. Distance to some of these facilities. only employment opportunity in local area without considerable travel, is Pointons factory. Questions need for more houses given lack of employment opportunities. CD003 forms part of natural shallow A520 valley [already current traffic noise problems, which would be exacerbated]. Pointons rendering factory [supply lorries] already source of smell complaints from residents. Brings into doubt whether any developers would be interested in developing this land for housing. Council's own housing requirement exceeds Government's by 2000. Questions if there is an ulterior motive for this. Lack of employment means lack of demand for properties. There are 2500 empty properties for sale in the Moorlands. Any land designated by Council for development, will BLIGHT all surrounding properties. Period of BLIGHT will be protracted, if interest to develop such a site fails to materialise. Before considering the development of this land both SCC+SMDC need to resolve current infrastructure problems, such as width of footpath, and improve A520 to a standard fit for purpose. if Council must consider additional houses, then must consider Leek/surrounding area brownfield sites first. eg Staffordshire Farmers Site [conditions to consent requiring reversion to coppice, not carried out - but recent planning application]. Options sites CD015/030/008/017/019/115 would only require minor/no amendment to Green Belt, they are continuation of development area and will require no encroachment into Wetley Rocks - this must be great advantage over sites CD002/CD003. Land at junction of Brookhouse Lane and A520 was offered to Council during Options consultation, but was rejected. In conjunction with abovementioned sites on west of A520, this site would form ideal infill development with little effect on Green Belt and village boundaries.	
PO9554	Mrs Anita M. Williams				CD002	Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site CD002: SMDC has ignored: safety concerns relating to A520; Folly Lane junction. Requirements of Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 The views of the Parish Council The views of Cheddleton residents Government Green Belt Policy The lack of infrastructure, or infrastrucure already at capacity (schools, medical services etc). Nearest primary school 1.6miles away generating car trips/need for buses. Distances to other facilities. The spirit of the Localism Act 2011 site does not meet NPPFsustainability objectives site has infrequent bus services to other parts of North Staffordshire. site entrance at confluence of two opposing hills. Vehicles exceed speed limit [exceeds 80 decibels noise]. Health and safety an issue. Foot and cycle access to local	• See response to PO1467 regarding Green Belt , highways and brownfield site • See response to PO2366 regarding infrastructure and location/facilities • See response to PO9557 regarding trees and employment • See response to PO109 regarding landscape • See response to PO3898 regarding the need for houses

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							amenities half a mile away, requires crossing this road. Narrow pavement, large passing vehicles. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [historic appeal failed on these very grounds]. site has many ancient trees and hedgerows. Many trees need TPO status as they had significant interest. Therefore site requires ecological survey, in public domain, prior to development. Consideration of landscape must be a paramount consideration [from Core Strategy]. Also need to ensure access routes to/from Churnet Valley should be maintained with attractive vistas. Council ignoring own policy. development would mean 132 houses in total will all need to access via Rock End Drive/A520. Folly Lane is narrow with major problems without major improvements. Without a Folly Lane access, any obstruction to Rock End access would isolate site from emergency vehicles. Properties in SMD/around CD002/CD003 hard to sell. There are thousands of empty properties in area. Therefore need for greenfield development not demonstrated, given brownfield sites could meet need. Equivalent employment prospects are not available, will lead to further commuting. 2012 Pointons consent had condition requiring applicant to coppice adjacent Staffordshire Farmers site. This was withdrawn as a Local Plan site option on the basis that many HGVs use A520 there. Argues that CD003 junction only 500m away, has similar characteristics, therefore both sites should be given equal consideration.	
PO311	Dr Gordon Wright				CD002	Object	Major problems with building on this site include access, especially for children going to school in Wetley Rocks, contiguity between the largest village in Staffordshire and Wetley Rocks and waste removal. Several houses on Folly Lane opposite CD002 have drainage problems due to the adverse slope of the land in relation to the sump and the remote location of the pumping station on the western side of the A520. The building plans would need to include a complete revision of the existing drains. Alternative sites are available in Cheddleton. CD015 is classified as brown field land and could be used for housing development if the requirement for it to be converted to green belt was revoked. CD115 is also an obvious choice since it would avoid the problem of contiguity. Indeed, it would eliminate the anomalous separation of the north and south parts of Cheddleton.	• See response to PO1467 regarding highways and Green Belt • The Environment Agency recognise the site maybe at the top of a catchment area, there do not think flood risk will prohibit development but consider an assessment of flood risk should be undertaken at the planning application stage. The County Council consider there is a potential flooding issue and recommend any developer should liaise with the County Council • Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO2514	Mr D Hartley				CD002	Object	the site cd002 shown on the map and listed as land south of rockend/millstone edge, cheddleton. and site Cd003 shown on the map and listed as land west and south of 70 - 82 folly lane, cheddleton, both site lie within the green belt outside the village boundary until the interference of the green belt body review took the arbitrary decision to change the green belt boundary there. I strongly object to inclusion of both areas of land for the development that would eventually link two villages and there	• See response to PO1467 regarding the Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							would be major road/highway issues. A similar proposal was refused on appeal some years ago. The council cannot support these 2 areas of land on the grounds that the green belt inn on both sites , outside the village boundary there is a strong need to maintain a definite village boundary between cheddleton and wetley rocks,. I must therefore as these 2 areas of land to be removed	
PO2700	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			CD002	Object	If it is decided to continue with sites in the floodplain or likely to be following the application of the Sequential Test, then further work in the form of a Level 2 SFRA will be required for the following site: CD002 which along with CD003 is adjacent to Watercourses with no mapped floodplain. This does not mean the site is within Flood Zone 1.	Comments noted
PO2294 PO2265 PO2266 PO2264 PO2243 PO2277 PO2293 PO2253 PO2288 PO2301 PO2271 PO2245 PO2292 PO2242 PO2262 PO2254 PO2246 PO2297	Mrs D Bullock Mrs N Axford Ann Harrison Mr Malcolm Cunningham T.C. Spragg Ms Judith Dean F.D. Rogers Michael Reeves Mrs Susan Skittrell Mrs Patricia Malkin Mr and Mrs D Foster Mrs Julie Wheel Mr Peter Jones Mr and Mrs D. Tellwright Mrs Sandra Gaunt Mr P.A. Edwards Ms J Pegg Mr George James Tatton	Chairman Leek and District Fly Fishing Association			CD002	Object	as a potential site allocation for housing CD002 I strongly object to CD002s inclusion in the local plan preferred options sites and boundary maps. I fully understand the need to develop a local plane however by including this site the SMDC has ignored. 1) Safety concerns relating to the A520 2) The requirements of the town and country planning regulation's 3) The views of the parish council 4) The views of the people living in Cheddleton. 5) The government policy to protect the green belt land 6) The lack of infrastructure, including schools and medical services 7) The spirit of the location act 2011 To expand. 1) The site is designated in green belt 2) This site doesn't align with the National Planning Policy Framework regarding Green Belt. This proposed will effectively join Cheddleton to Wetley Rocks and encroaches onto the countryside. Site CD002 and CD003 provide the only green space between the 2 villages. 3) This site does not meet the sustainability objectives as detailed in the national planning policy framework. 4) No consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from this site by foot or cycle. 5) Site has an infrequent bus service to the other parts of North Staffs 6) The A520 between Ostlers Lane Wetley Rocks has significant History of road accidents. On the data shows that there have been 22 accidents between 2005 and 2013, despite the installation of Cameras inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 7) The pavement on the A520 is narrow (less than 1m) and on 1 side only. Cars travel legally at 50 mph and it is considered that this does not form a safe walking route for those accessing it. Such as schools etc. in the village centre. 8) The junction off Folly Lane and Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 9) The site is 1.6 miles away from the catchment Primary schools. Given the lack of provisions for pedestrians, cycles and the infrequent bus service, the obvious method of accessing the schools and increase the Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 10) Schools in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in population and are currently full or have a small number of vacant places. This proposed	- See response to PO 1467 regarding the Green Belt and highways - See response to PO 299 regarding the consultation and feedback - See response to PO2366 regarding location/facilities, wildlife and infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2298	Ms Monica Tatton						residential development would require significant investment to address this issue. In addition further buses would be required to transport 5 to 13 pupils to Leek as there is no provision in the village. 11) It is considered that the existing utilities in this area could not sustain an increase in demand significant investment. This has not been considered. 12) Site has no substantial access to GP surgery. 13) It is known that the developer has attempted to coerce the Parish Council/SMDC for over approximately 20 years to support the release this site from Green Belt. Every attempt has previously been blocked by the parish council and residents of Cheddleton. This demonstrates the strength of feeling 14) Site has numerous trees that are known habitat wildlife, including a known bat population.	
PO2283	Ms Tracy Williamson							
PO2261	Mr Neil Adams							
PO2259	Ms Carol Adams							
PO2275	Mr Joseph Malkin							
PO2287	Mrs Janice Perkin							
PO2300	Mr and Mrs Reg Clowes							
PO2278	Mr Alan Keates							
PO2285	Mrs Dorothy Hampson							
PO2263	Mr Gordon Harrison							
PO2251	Mr S Bailey							
PO2303	Mrs O Thorley							
PO2247	Mrs M Aston							
PO2241	Mr M Thorley							
PO2248	Mr S Clowes							
PO2250	Mr J Cooper							
PO2249	Miss G Cooper							
PO2252	Mr M Brindley							
PO2256	Mrs S Brindley							
PO2255	Mr J Alcock							
PO2257	Mr And Mrs T Mellor							
PO2269	Mr R Bettany							
PO2279	Mrs J Humphreys							
PO2280	Mr A Leonard							
PO2281	Mr C Viggars							
PO2282	Mrs R Viggars							

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2291	Mrs P Alcock							
PO2290	Mrs B Hulse							
PO2295	Mr R Perry							
PO2296	Mrs B Perry							
PO2258	Mrs E Horne							
PO2268	Mrs V Bettany							
PO2286	Mr MD Wootton							
PO2270	Mr B Bevington							
PO2273	Miss C Hollins							
PO2274	Mr M Hollins							
PO2302	Ms V Pegg							
PO2289	Mr Plimley							
PO2410	Mr Mark Wheel							
PO2406	Mr and Mrs A Harrison							
PO2384	Mrs Doreen Tildesley							
PO2390	J.E. Keeling							
PO2422	Mr George Wheel							
PO2374	Mr Peter Jones							
PO2404	Ms Emily Wheel							
PO2418	Mrs M Turner							
PO2402	C Pegg							
PO2386	Mr and Mrs J Lindan							
PO2416	Mr M McCall							
PO2414	Mrs K McCall							
PO2394	Mrs E Horne							
PO2412	Mrs S Hathaway							
PO2392	Mrs P Kelsall							
PO2408	Mr A Harrison							
PO2420	Mr A Cowdy							
PO2428	Mr And Mrs RJ/S Morris							

Cheddleton

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2430	Mrs B Knight							
PO2424	Ms C Knight-holland							
PO2426	Mr A Harrison							
PO2400	Mrs C Smith							
PO2398	Mr ML Edwards							
PO2396	Mr S Tomlin							
PO2388	Mr G Atkinson							

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO4503	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			Support	Allocations CD002 and CD003 are supported [for the reasons set out in greater detail in the attachments to Question 1 response].	Comments noted
PO2194	Mrs S Brindley				Object	I consider the removal; of site CD003 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD003 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote “to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks” The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD003 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMDC has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD003 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The lookwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance”. SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD003 as a potential site allocation for housing I consider the removal; of site CD003 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD003 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote “to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and	- The land in question is within the Green Belt The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. It found the site’s overall impact on Green Belt’s purposes were moderate “<i>Despite being a relatively large edge-of-settlement site, development would not intrude into open countryside, being contained physically and visually by a drain and hedgerow between Folly Lane and the A520 Cheadle Road.</i>” and recommended the site could be consider for release under exceptional circumstances. . In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. - The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that “<i>The site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area. However, the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 7 trees and species rich hedgerow which values the site as having district ecological importance</i>”.
PO2224	Mrs D Bullock						
PO2233	Mr and Mrs A Harrison						
PO2237	Ann Harrison						
PO2185	Mrs Doreen Tildesley						
PO2182	T.C. Spragg						
PO2199	F.D. Rogers						
PO2219	Mr Roger Hampson						
PO2222	Mrs Susan Skittrell						
PO2227	Mrs Patricia Malkin						
PO2188	Mr Steven Clowes						
PO2117	Mr and Mrs D Foster						
PO2184	Mrs Julie Wheel						
PO2181	Mr and Mrs D. Tellwright						
PO2206	Mrs Sandra Gaunt						
PO2236	Mr P.A. Edwards						
PO2217	Mrs Helen Whitehouse						
PO2232	Mr Russell Perry						
PO2187	Ms J Pegg						
PO2216	Mr and Mrs J Lindan						
PO2204	Mr M McCall						
PO2231	Mr George James						
PO2196	Ms Monica Tatton						
PO2208	Ms Tracy Williamson						

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2201	Mr Neil Adams					settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks” The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD003 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMDC has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD003 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The lookwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance”. SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD003 as a potential site allocation for housing	
PO2218	Mrs Janice Perkin						
PO2221	Mr Philip Eley						
PO2226	Mr and Mrs Reg Clowes						
PO2186	Mr and Mrs L Keates						
PO2203	Mr Gordon Harrison						
PO2190	Mr S Bailey						
PO2189	Mr J Cooper						
PO2191	Miss G Cooper						
PO2192	Mr M Brindley						
PO2193	Mrs S Hathaway						
PO2198	Mr And Mrs T Mellor						
PO2213	Mrs C Mellor						
PO2223	Mr R Bettany						
PO2235	Mrs J Humphreys						
PO2205	Mr A Leonard						
PO2214	Mr C Viggars						
PO2215	Mrs R Viggars						
PO2211	Mrs B Hulse						
PO2234	Miss J Leonard						
PO2131	Mrs G Eley						
PO2207	Mrs E Horne						
PO2195	Mrs V Bettany						
PO2209	Mr M Reeves						
PO2220	Mr MD Wootton						
PO2225	Mr B Bevington						
PO2229	Miss C Hollins						

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2230 PO2212 PO2238 PO2239	Mr M Hollins Mr P Jones Ms V Pegg Mr Plimley						
PO585 PO933	Mrs Susan Buxton Mr John Buxton				Object	I most strongly object to the proposal to build approximately 76 houses on site CD003. Access to this site would appear to be primarily through Rockend Drive and Millstone Edge, both small, minor roads to a small community of houses. Residents' parking would be severely affected and the risk of damage to parked cars would increase massively. I would estimate that 76 houses would mean at least an increase of 100+ vehicles using these minor roads and attempting to access the A520 would be even more difficult and hazardous than it already is. This particular stretch of the A520 between Folley Lane and Wetley Rocks is already a dangerous road, access to which is right at the bottom of a steep hill in either direction, with a current speed limit of 50mph. Increasing the number of vehicles by such a large number would further increase the risk of accidents even if the speed limit was reduced.	The Highways Authority advises that development acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays. But preferable for CD002 to be developed in conjunction with CD003, with bulk of access through CD003
PO2438 PO2432 PO2455 PO2442 PO2451 PO2444 PO2453 PO2459 PO2468 PO2436 PO2465 PO2440 PO2472	Mrs C Atkinson Ms Judith Dean Mr Mark Wheel Mr. Martyn Findlow Mr A Harrison Mrs P Kelsall Mr A Harrison Mr A Cowdy Mr And Mrs RJ/S Morris Mrs B Knight Ms C Knight-holland Mr S Tomlin Mrs O Thorley				Object	I strongly object to CD002s inclusion in the local plan preferred options sites and boundary maps. I fully understand the need to develop a local plan however by including this site the SMDC has ignored. 1) Safety concerns relating to the A520 2) The requirements of the town and country planning regulation's 3) The views of the parish council 4) The views of the people living in Cheddleton. 5) The government policy to protect the green belt land 6) The lack of infrastructure, including schools and medical services 7) The spirit of the location act 2011 To expand. 1) The site is designated in green belt 2) This site doesn't align with the National Planning Policy Framework regarding Green Belt. This proposed will effectively join Cheddleton to Wetley Rocks and encroaches onto the countryside. Site CD002 and CD003 provide the only green space between the 2 villages. 3) This site does not meet the sustainability objectives as detailed in the national planning policy framework. 4) No consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from this site by foot or cycle. 5) Site has an infrequent bus service to the other parts of North Staffs 6) The A520 between Ostlers Lane Wetley Rocks has significant History of road accidents. On the data shows that there have been 22 accidents between 2005 and 2013, despite the installation of Cameras inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 7) The pavement on the A520 is narrow (less than 1m) and on 1 side only. Cars travel legally at 50 mph and it is considered that this does not form a safe walking route for those accessing it. Such as schools etc. in the village centre. 8) The junction off Folly Lane and Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 9) The site is 1.6 miles away from the catchment Primary schools. Given the lack of provisions for pedestrians, cycles and the	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2194 regarding Green Belt and wildlife - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						infrequent bus service, the obvious method of accessing the schools and increase the Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 10) Schools in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in population and are currently full or have a small number of vacant places. This proposed residential development would require significant investment to address this issue. In addition further buses would be required to transport 5 to 13 pupils to Leek as there is no provision in the village. 11) It is considered that the existing utilities in this area could not sustain an increase in demand significant investment. This has not been considered. 12) Site has no substantial access to GP surgery. 13) It is known that the developer has attempted to coerce the Parish Council/SMDC for over approximately 20 years to support the release this site from Green Belt. Every attempt has previously been blocked by the parish council and residents of Cheddleton. This demonstrates the strength of feeling 14) Site has numerous trees that are known habitat wildlife, including a known bat population.	The Core Strategy defines Cheddleton as a larger village with a range of facilities and services
PO9553 PO9555	Mr J B Williams Mrs Anita M. Williams				Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached to Rep PO9550] objecting to both Preferred Options site CD022 and CD003: only access road to CD003 is totally inadequate. Major improvements required site entrance at confluence of two opposing hills. Vehicles exceed speed limit, many accidents have happened in this area. Foot and cycle access to local amenities requires crossing this road. narrow pavement, large passing vehicles. Need prior independent investigation [fatal traffic injuries] before further development. if future development incorporated Rock End Drive/A520, this would be ludicrous accident blackspot. Question why these sites being considered given they are Green Belt. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [1970s appeal failed on these very grounds]. site has many ancient trees and hedgerows. Many trees need TPO status as they had significant interest. Consideration of landscape must be a paramount consideration [from Core Strategy]. Also need to ensure access routes to/from Churnet Valley should be maintained with attractive vistas. Council ignoring own policy. Development of 96 dwellings will result in grave infrastructure problems - local services will not cope. Local schools are near capacity, and access on foot to these dangerous. Sewage system, doctors, dentist, local electricity supply etc already over capacity. Distance to some of these facilities. only employment opportunity in local area without considerable travel, is Pointons factory. Questions need for more houses given lack of employment opportunities. CD003 forms part of natural shallow A520 valley [already current traffic noise problems, which would be exacerbated]. Pointons rendering factory [supply lorries] already source of smell complaints from residents. Brings into doubt whether any developers would be interested in developing this land for housing. Council's own housing requirement exceeds Government's by 2000. Questions if there is an ulterior motive for	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2194 regarding Green Belt and trees - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure - The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations The Study found the site was of low landscape sensitivity - An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need. - Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						this. Lack of employment means lack of demand for properties. There are 2500 empty properties for sale in the Moorlands. Any land designated by Council for development, will BLIGHT all surrounding properties. Period of BLIGHT will be protracted, if interest to develop such a site fails to materialise. Before considering the development of this land both SCC+SMDC need to resolve current infrastructure problems, such as width of footpath, and improve A520 to a standard fit for purpose. if Council must consider additional houses, then must consider Leek/surrounding area brownfield sites first. eg Staffordshire Farmers Site [conditions to consent requiring reversion to coppice, not carried out - but recent planning application]. Options sites CD015/030/008/017/019/115 would only require minor/no amendment to Green Belt, they are continuation of development area and will require no encroachment into Wetley Rocks - this must be great advantage over sites CD002/CD003. Land at junction of Brookhouse Lane and A520 was offered to Council during Options consultation, but was rejected. In conjunction with abovementioned sites on west of A520, this site would form ideal infill development with little effect on Green Belt and village boundaries.	
PO1897	Babb Family				Object	1. Safety concerns relating to the A520 2. The requirements of the Town & County Planning Regs.2012. 3. The views of the Parish Council. 4.The views of people living in Cheddleton. 5 .The Government Policy to protect Green Belt. 6.The lack of Infrastructure, including schools & medical services. 7.The spirit of the Localism Act 2011. We strongly object to CD003's This is Green Belt Land. Reason houses weren't built previously as it was considered a danger some years ago. Now the roads are more congested. Plus it will affect properties values which people have worked long and hard to secure. Very limited 'bus service from this area.	- The views of residents and the Parish Council have been sought through the consultations. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. - See response to PO2194 regarding Green Belt - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure and location/facilities
PO3870	J E Keeling				Object	No to this development on Greenbelt land No to joining two villages Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. No to a dangerous road – A520 No to no infrastructure. No to more cars on the roads. No to noise and pollution. We live around here and want to stay semi rural – no no no to CD003. Please look at other alternatives sites preferred by residents and parish councils.	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2194 regarding highways
PO1468	Mrs D Bullock				Object	Before listing my objections to area CD003 and CD002in cheddleton staffs being passed of the building of 92 houses. I would question how anyone based in Glossop Derbyshire with a Stockport Postcode can know much about Cheddleton Staffs, with regard to building houses there why can't local councillors have control over this, and they know the area well to make the correct decisions. Objections On a number of occasions Planning has been applied for on sites CD002 and CD003 and been refused. In 1978 planning permission was refused. In 1978 planning permission was refused on the grounds of: Green Belt, traffic, and drainage problems on the site	- The decisions on the Local Plan will be made by Staffordshire Moorlands District Councillors before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for Examination. - Previous applications were refused under existing planning policy the proposed Local Plan will replace existing policy and seeks to allocate housing sites to meet objectively assessed need of the District.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						with the system. How has this situation changed in 2016 Green Belt still exists, with even make reason to preserve for the future generations. Traffic Since 1978 the traffic situation on the main road must have increased 20x + all the extra cars from the hospital site Basford Bridge Lane est and Leek brook estate all built in 1978. Drainage – No change in this situation either still the same problem as in 1978 so how can a site CD002 and CD003 suddenly become so acceptable in 2016. For example the traffic situation today 6/5/16. Tarmacking was taking place at Leek brook on the main road at 1.30pm the queue of traffic from Leek were back to the Britannia roundabout back to station road – a quiet time of the day imagine another 92 houses coming onto this road each day which is known as Williamsons Hollow a very dangerous spot to emerge onto main road where the speed limit is 50mph. The other entrance onto Folly Lane please note 'lane' with passing places totally unsuitable. Cars parked on the lane at all times from the houses. As CD003 and CD002 would connect to the boundary with Wetley Rocks village, this boundary defines the 2 villages so does this mean the 2 villages would then become 1, and if 3 in 10 houses would be started home with no doubt children, they would have to be driven to school as no schools are within walking distance. Surely the sensible thing to do in this situation would be spread the building of 92 houses over a few smaller areas more within the Cheddleton brown field sites – Leek brook est on a factory site. Why can this site be considered and keep the Green Belt sites safe for the future. Common sense should surely prevent and this important matter	- As part of this process the existing Green Belt boundaries are being looked at. - See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2194 regarding Green Belt - The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field options have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO300	Ms Julie Brownhill				Object	Development of this site will join together the villages of Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks. The access onto the A520 is poorly located and is in a 50mph area. There has been no consideration given to the lack of infrastructure such as doctors and dentists and no consideration given to the provision of school places. The distance from Cheddleton village centre will result in more car journeys with the resultant increase in pollution. There will be loss of amenity to surrounding properties. The views of the Parish Council and residents have been ignored by the District Council.	- See response to PO2193 regarding Green Belt - See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO1897 regarding the consultation process - Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application
PO1400	Mr D Keeling				Object	Does anyone really listen? We strongly object to site CD003 been even considered for housing development – this site in the past has been refused planning permission twice – does anyone really listen? Building site CD003 would link Wetly Rocks which is fundamentally against Green belt principle. It would of course cause more traffic onto the busy A520 Cheadle Road which has in the past has had numerous accidents, how many times have the walls been knocked down by lorries, cars running along the back of	- See response to PO1897 regarding the consultation process - See response to PO1468 regarding previous application refusals - See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure - See response PO2194 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						one of the other as traffic turns right into rock end drive. Where is this infrastructure going to go? We are a village, not a town we have no facilities i.e. shops, Dr Surgeries – etc. How will our schools cope with the extra pupils? Think of the noise and pollution we would have to endure. At the council meeting in Leek which we attended, it was said @plans are not set in stone’ so they can be changed. Please do not build on CD003, keep it green belt, other alternative sites are available as our councillors have identified – please listen? We live here. NO NO NO to the development of CD003	- If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO3897	Mrs G & M Pyatt				Object	Exceptionally busy road, A520 which would access these sites. 96 Houses could mean another 150-200 extra cars using this road. It would mean that Cheddleton + Wetley Rocks would be joined together so no green space or area in-between. Lack of infrastructure i.e.: schools + medical services – both overloaded now. This land is in the Green Belt + provides habitat for wildlife. There are already lots of houses for sale in this area (see Leek Post and Times) which are not selling, so why do we need more.	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2194 regarding the Green Belt and wildlife - See response to PO1468 regarding the need for houses
PO3884	J.E. Keeling				Object	Hope me writing to you the 3 rd time is lucky. This is another objection to site: CD003 and CD002. Both lie in the green belt and in the past have been rejected twice as on unsuitable site for development it would go against the principle of greenbelt policy in joining the village of Cheddleton/Wetley rocks we would like to keep our villages separate – please – We have a unique identity in Staffordshire Moorlands and wish to retain it. It would create major road issues and road issues and other problems. 2 other site which residents and the parish council are in favour off is: CD115 in the centre of the village Staffordshire Farmers site which is a Brownfield Site. Please if possible when all parties meet to discuss our needs as well as finding a alternative site more suitable for development, I ask fir site CD003/CD002 to be removed from your plans.	- See response to PO2194 regarding the Green Belt - See response to PO1468 regarding previous application refusals - See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO1468 regarding brownfield sites - See response to PO9553 regarding Site Options sites
PO111	Dr Alan Jones				Object	Housing density too high compared with adjacent development. CD002 and CD003 comprise over 90 homes, a huge increase in an already quite dense area. Access at this point to A520 is not good.	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - Any new development will be subject to the design policies in the new Local Plan
PO2701	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	If it is decided to continue with sites in the floodplain or likely to be following the application of the Sequential Test, then further work in the form of a Level 2 SFRA will be required for the following site: CD003 which along with CD002 is adjacent to Watercourses with no mapped floodplain. This does not mean the site is within Flood Zone 1.	- Comments noted - Further consultation with the EA indicated flooding would not prohibit development but issue would need further assessment at the planning application stage
PO314	Dr Gordon Wright				Object	Major problems with building on this site include access, especially for children going to school in Wetley Rocks, contiguity between	- See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO1468 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						the largest village in Staffordshire and Wetley Rocks and waste removal. Planning permission has been refused twice previously partly due to the difficulty in achieving satisfactory waste removal. The building plans would need to include a complete revision of the existing drains and the pumping station on the western side of the A520. Alternative sites are available in Cheddleton. CD015 is classified as brown field land and could be used for housing development if the requirement for it to be converted to green belt was revoked. CD115 is also an obvious choice since it would avoid the problem of contiguity. Indeed, it would eliminate the anomalous separation of the north and south parts of Cheddleton.	previous application refusals See response to PO9553 regarding Site Options sites
PO9559	Mr C J Coates				Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options sited CD002 + CD003: Does not meet with Government Policy [in Green Belt and agricultural land] and requires change of village boundary [incorporate part of Wetley Rocks] A520 trunk road is not fit for purpose [already traffic accidents]. Addition of large number of heavy vehicles is overwhelming. site entrance at confluence of two opposing hills. Vehicles exceed speed limit [exceeds 80 decibels noise]. Health and safety an issue. Foot and cycle access to local amenities requires crossing this road. narrow pavement, large passing vehicles. question the capability of the public utilities/services in the area; they are at their capacity limit. Significant major improvements required. site has many ancient trees and hedgerows. Many trees need TPO status as they had significant interest. Therefore site requires ecological survey, in public domain, prior to development. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [historic appeal failed on these very grounds]. Core Strategy states that need to ensure any access routes to/from Churnet Valley should be maintained with attractive vistas. A520 is example of this. development would mean 132 houses in total will all need to access via Rock End Drive/A520. Folly Lane is narrow with major problems without major improvements. Without a Folly Lane access, any obstruction to Rock End access would isolate site from emergency vehicles. Primary school at Wetley Rocks (that children of site would attend) has dangerous junction of Mill Lane/A520 (HGVs mount narrow pavement). Would be exacerbated by on street parking at school. Properties in SMD/around CD002/CD003 hard to sell. There are thousands of empty properties in area. Therefore need for greenfield development not demonstrated, given brownfield sites could meet need. Equivalent employment prospects are not available, will lead to further commuting. Therefore need for properties in local area has not be shown. Lack of local employment prospects will lead to further commuting. 2012 Pointons consent had condition requiring applicant to coppice adjacent Staffordshire Farmers site. This was withdrawn as a Local Plan site option on the basis that many HGVs use A520 there. Argues that CD003 junction only 500m away, has similar characteristics, therefore both sites should be given equal consideration. Options sites CD015/030/008	- See response to PO2194 regarding the Green Belt, wildlife & trees - See response to PO585 regarding highways - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO2438 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO1468 regarding the need for houses & brownfield sites - See response to PO9553 regarding employment and landscape

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						would only require minor/no amendment to Green Belt, they are continuation of development area and will require no encroachment into Wetley Rocks.	
PO2031	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Object	Site CD002 shown on the map and listed as land South of Rockend Drive/Millstone Edge, Cheddleton..... and Site CD003 shown on the map and listed as land West and South of 70-82 Folly Lane, Cheddleton. Both sites lie within the Green Belt and outside the village boundary. The Council strongly objects to the inclusion of both areas of land for development given that it would effectively link two villages and there would be major road/highway issues. As stated above, both sites lie within the Green Belt and outside the village boundary and any development of the site would degrade the natural gateway to the village of Wetley Rocks, which enhances the individuality of the village and contributes positively to the feeling of leaving or entering a place. If allocated it would go against two major principles of the Green Belt Policy. It would go against a major coalescent – the joining of two communities and the Council must ask for these two areas of land to be removed.	• See response to PO2194 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO9553 regarding landscape
PO4	Mr Peter Blakeman				Object	The proposed sites CD002 and CD003 are unsympathetic to the local community and its residents and commit to growth that is unsuitable, unsupportable and unsustainable for the current local facilities in Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks. The proposal represents an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and in the absence of any special circumstances would by its inappropriateness have a harmful impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of the Green Belt. Greenbelt areas were created to stop neighbouring towns merging into one another. If the proposed sites CD002 and CD003 are used this removes any discernible boundary between Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton removing the original character of the separate towns. Tree protection orders should also be in place on the tree's and hedging running across the centre of the proposed sites discussed as they house a discernible amount of wildlife. These two sites are also outside of the current village boundary and therefore should not be considered for development. Local facilities in Cheddleton already struggle to support the needs of existing residents in terms of education, healthcare, unsuitable minor roads, shops and other facilities. There is no doctors surgery in Cheddleton, the closest one being Werrington Village Surgery which is already heavily oversubscribed. The closest school to these sites in St Johns in Wetley Rocks, which has a yearly intake of just 16 children. Given that there is no suitable footpath from Folly Lane or the sites mentioned it is also difficult to access Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks by foot. The development will have adverse effects on a huge number of properties exacerbated by the small gardens of the properties. These include but are not limited to overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.	• See response to PO2438 regarding location/facilities and infrastructure • See response to PO2194 regarding the Green Belt and trees • See response to PO300 regarding residential amenity

Cheddleton

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO529	Mrs V Millar				Object	This proposed location results in a removal of a rural landscape to those householders on the road. By putting houses in this area it adds to the traffic issue as more vehicles will be coming out on to the A520 which is currently a 50 mile limit, with potential to cause more accidents with more persons and the speed limit. It seems this has remained as a proposed location as the residents are not in the same numbers as those of other locations which have since been removed from the proposals. The impact on the local area would be extensive due to access, amenities, also the issues of losing the wildlife which occupies the fields proposed to be built upon.	- The Highways Authority advises that they require more details/clarification regarding how access to site would be achieved, before can comment. - Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application - The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 found the site was generally of low biodiversity value in overall terms of the area
PO2032	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Object	Site CD017 shown on the map as land to the rear of 403-411 Cheadle Road, Cheddleton. The Council are opposed to the inclusion of this land on the grounds that it lies within the Green Belt and the fact that a detached house would have to be demolished to provide an access to the site. The Council ask for this site to be removed.	- See response to PO529 regarding highways - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was limited and recommended the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt.
PO110	Dr Alan Jones				Object	Not sensible at all to put over 20 homes on this site. Totally out of keeping with the present character of the site, which is low density larger homes, and road access is dangerous at this point, just after bend on 50mph A520	- Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area consideration will be given to the scale of development and its impact on the surrounding area. - See response to PO529 regarding highways
PO1256	Ms Janet Pitt				Object	I feel that the preferred sample CD017 is unsuitable development it appears that a property would have to be demolished to provide access. A far more suitable site on the opposite side of the road CD015 would provide a safer access to a very busy main road and	See response to PO529

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						would not affect the existing resident's views or privacy. Also adjacent to CD015 a depot which appears to be unused which together with CD015 could easily provide the space for development	
PO1260 PO1257	Mr Darryl Pitt Mr A Pitt				Object	I feel that the preferred sample CD017 is unsuitable development it appears that a property would have to be demolished to provide access. A far more suitable site on the opposite side of the road CD015 would provide a safer access to a very busy main road and would not affect the existing resident's views or privacy. Also adjacent to CD015 a depot which appears to be unused which together with CD015 could easily provide the space for development	See response to PO529 regarding highways/residential amenity

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2513	Mr D Hartley				Support	CD088 - This site lies within the development boundary and I fully support and accept this site to form part of the forthcoming SM Local Plan.	Support noted CD088 is not included as an allocation as it is within the village boundary and could be developed as infill.
PO2515	Mr D Hartley				Support	CD017 - shown on the map as land at the rear off 403-411 Cheadle Road, Cheddleton. Planning permission has already been granted for a development and the Parish Council fully supports the inclusion of this site.	Support noted
PO2033	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Support	With regard to the land at 397 Cheadle Road, Cheddleton. Planning permission has already been granted for a development and the Parish Council fully supports the inclusion of this site.	Support noted
PO2034	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Support	CD115 the site lies within the Green Belt however, it is in the centre of the village and the Council would support the inclusion of this site in order to satisfy and meet the needs of this settlement's requirements.	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. This included sites CD115 & CD015. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The sites are within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the sites were not suitable for release from the Green Belt.
PO2035	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Support	Staffordshire Farmers Site this is the only brownfield site in Cheddleton; it has an established access onto the A520 Cheadle Road and the Council must ask for this site to be included given that it will satisfy and meet the needs of this settlement's requirements.	This site has planning permission and will be taken into account in assessing the housing requirement for the Plan.
PO331	Mr Greg Bicker				Object	The Development of CD002 and CD003 would greatly change the character of the area in question, Cheddleton. The joining of Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks through abolishing greenbelt land would go against the entire ethos of green belt, to prevent urban sprawl and preserve open countryside in its permanence. The density of the development in question is out of proportion to the local area as Rockend drive and Millstone Edge have only 31 properties in the developments entirety. There are a further 21 houses that border the CD002 and CD003 plots from Folly lane. The proposed 96 houses in this area would significantly change the feel and characteristics of the area. CD002 and CD003 are Green belt areas, with established trees and minor waterways. There are thought to be 3 species of bat present in the local area, Common pipistrelle, Soprano pipistrelle and Brown Long-eared bat. I have	The proposed sites in Cheddleton are within the Green Belt The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. It found the all the sites in Cheddleton overall impact on Green Belt's purposes were moderate. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						witnessed bat activity at night in the area, but to my knowledge, no formal ecological surveys have been completed or published that demonstrate the impact on the local wildlife that development of these ecosystems would implicate. The development of CD002 and CD003 would bring in increase in population that would overwhelm local amenities, of which Cheddleton is not plentiful. I appreciate the long term vision, that increased population leads to increased development of amenities, but we live in the present, so plans for this should be put in place at the same time as development plans are hurriedly prepared. The population increase would also bring an increase in vehicles, with little local employment, most people will commute to work. With the development of affordable homes for working people, this could mean 1-2 (or even more) cars per developed property. This represents a possible 192 additional cars attempting to exit Rockend drive in the rush hour periods, onto a 50mph road which is already busy. The turn for Rockend drive falls within a natural dip, with speed cameras on the high pints each side, this encourages people to speed down/ up the road at the point where Rockend drive joins, then slow for the speed cameras when approaching the top of this hill. This is already dangerous. Increasing the number of vehicles making right turns in and out of this road will only increase the instances of accidents. CD002 received 50 comments with 48 objections, CD003 received 69 comments with 67 objections in the previous public consultation. considering the level of population in this part of Cheddleton, this is overwhelming objection to development of this pretty green belt land that provides a scenic backdrop to the end of the village boundary as well as maintaining the rural feel of the rural village. A common frustration is the lack of council interest in using suggested rather than enforced spaces. Cheddleton parish council are suggesting CD015 and CD115 as alternative development land. It is also confusing why brownfield infill is not being considered over greenbelt abolition. CD015 is adjacent to another brownfield site that still lies in disarray and is a local eye saw. The development of the "depot" that lies directly south of CD015 would be good use of brownfield and facilitate infill with less deviation from village boundaries. As a local resident, I have concerns that the land of CD002 and CD003 is, in my understanding, owned by a non-local developer. Due to this the land owner will be very keen for the process to go ahead with little concern for effect on local character/ amenities and quality of life. There is also concern about the current abundance of property in Cheddleton, of varied value, that is currently unsold. Why do we need more housing if the current stock is not in demand in our local area. Developing more affordable housing would ultimately limit those currently in this band of housing in the area to sell their property when they want to take a step up the property ladder, as there will be a saturated supply market of affordable housing for sale with low demand due to poor local amenities, employment, transport links and the ongoing environment agency issues regarding the unpleasant odour of the local rendering plant. Overall, unwanted, not required, poor reasoning for choice of greenbelt over brown field, incorrect housing density, loss of identity if Cheddleton and Wetley Rock are to be joined.	to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. - The Highways Authority advises that development of CD002 & CD003 is acceptable subject to certain provisos but require further information regarding the access for CD017. - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field options have been proposed .Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy - The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations The Study found "CD003 was of medium landscape sensitivity and that site-specific landscape mitigation measures could include phased development (ensuring site is developed in combination with CD003)." CD003 and CD017 are of low landscape sensitivity - The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that all the Cheddleton sites had mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area. - An assessment of the District's employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/polices to meet this need. - See response to PO2034 regarding site CD115 - Brownfield sites within the Green Belt can be developed in accordance with existing green belt policy - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field options have been proposed .Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy - Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable - Staffordshire Farmers site has planning permission

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2425	Ms C Knight-holland				General comment	Preferred sites CD030 and CD015 Staffs Farmers, CD017, CD115 off Cheadle Road .	- See response to PO2034 regarding sites CD115 & CD015 - CD017 is a proposed site - CD030 is the Staffordshire Farmers site which has planning permission for residential development
PO2411 PO2352 PO2326 PO2344 PO2427 PO2491 PO2452 PO2340 PO2346	Mr Mark Wheel Mr G Wheel Ms Emily Wheel Mr A Cowdy Mr A Harrison Alexander Harrison Mr A Harrison Mrs B Knight Mr A Harrison				General comment	Preferred sites CD030 CD015 CD017 CD115	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2016	Mr Joe Smith				Support	I agree entirely with the above sites Cheddleton Parish Council suggests for development. These being site CD115 and CD015 as alternative sites for development.	See response to PO2034
PO2401	Mrs C Smith				General comment	I strongly endorse the comments above and suggestions made by Cheddleton Parish Council ie development / allocation of site CD115 & CD015 which should be allocated for housing development.	See response to PO2034
PO2433	Ms Judith Dean				General comment	We already have very large farm traffic up and down very narrow lanes at times of the day and night, by adding to the traffic on such a narrow lane is a serious accident waiting to happen. Building any new houses in this area would seriously endanger the safety of residents. The area can not provide the essential systems such as shops (pharmacy) & schools. Both my husband and I very strongly object to this additional housing as the area is built up enough.	See response to PO331
PO2363 PO2435 PO2354 PO2375 PO2328 PO2336 PO2371 PO2373 PO2509 PO2369 PO2501 PO2385 PO2379 PO2377 PO2397	Mrs S Skittrell J.E. Keeling Mrs D Keeling Mr Peter Jones Mr P.A. Edwards C Pegg Mr and Mrs J Lindan Ms D Hadley Mrs D Keeling Mrs Helen Whitehouse Ms D Hadley Mrs D Tildesley Miss C Hollins Mr M Hollins Mr S Tomlin				General comment	Preferred sites CD115 and CD015	See response to PO2034

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2357	Ms J Pegg				General comment	CD115 and CD015 as brownfield alternatives have my support for the development.	See response to PO2034
PO2395	Mrs E Horne				General comment	We support the site of Staffordshire farmers and the land at the Heath House Farm.	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2338	Mrs M Turner				General comment	Preferred sites CD030 CD015	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2417	Mr M McCall				General comment	I agree entirely with the above comments and totally disagree with any building.	Comments noted.
PO2332	Mr M McCall				General comment	I strongly agree with Cheddleton Parish Council with their alternative sites.	Comments noted.
PO2365	Mr MD Wootton				General comment	I support the Cheddleton Parish Council proposal for alternative sites.	See response to PO2034
PO2367	Mr Roger Hampson				General comment	We support the suggestion of Cheddleton Parish Council that sites CD115 and CD015 be an alternative site for development.	See response to PO2034
PO2330	Mrs K McCall				General comment	I agree with all the above points and would ask that England is noted for its villages and to join Cheddleton with Wetley Rocks into an urban sprawl would be a disgrace. Our elected representative should be supporting the residents, and not the property developers, of building on green belt land. Look around you for brownfield sites and land with derelict buildings. There are plenty around.	- Comments noted - See response to PO331
PO2383	Ms T Williamson				General comment	Preferred site Staffordshire Farmers and Heath House Farm.	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2334	Mr M Reeves						
PO2381	Mr B Bevington				General comment	Alternative sites are CD115 and CD015 brownfield sites of Staffordshire Farmers and Heath House Farm.	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO1899	Babb Family				Support	There are however eminently viable sites which are suggested by Cheddleton Parish Council of CD115.	See response to PO2034
PO2389	Mr G Atkinson				General comment	Strong concerns regarding drainage as our gardens already flood. Light and noise pollution, effect on wildlife, exits/entrance of the site, making Millstone a car rat run, eliminates the physical boundary between Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks.	- See response to PO331 - If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO2458	Mrs K McCall				General comment	I agree with the above points and feel that smdc should start to listen to the residents and not the property developers. Save our green space.	Comments noted.
PO2505	Ms Patricia Cunningham				General comment	I support the alternative sites for development namely brown field site of staffs farmers land at heath house land.	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2503	Mrs J Plimley				General comment	Preferred site CD115	See response to PO2034
PO2324	Mr Plimley				General comment		
PO315	Ms Julie Brownhill				General comment	Instead of developing sites CD002 and CD003 it would be preferable to develop CD115 because this site is closer to the village centre and it has better access onto the A520.	See response to PO2034
PO530	Mrs V Millar				Object	The smaller locations should not be disadvantaged as a result of fewer persons and no physical petition/signage being produced. The area is built up enough with Pointons behind this area and the traffic coming/going as a result of the industrial works.	See response to PO331
PO590	Mrs Susan Buxton				Object	I have grave concerns that increasing the number of dwellings and therefore residents in Cheddleton would mean great strain on local	New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						schools, dentists and doctors. There is currently no doctor's surgery in Cheddleton and residents have to travel to Leek or Werrington to see a GP. Increasing the number of residents increases the number of people required to travel on an already busy road to access these services.	residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO934	Mr John Buxton				Object	Increasing the number of dwellings, and therefore residents, in Cheddleton would put great strain on local schools, dentists and doctors. There is currently no doctors' surgery in Cheddleton and residents have to travel to Leek or Werrington to see a GP. Increasing the number of residents increases the number of people required to travel on an already busy road to access these services	See response to PO590 and PO331
PO2407	Mr and Mrs A Harrison				General comment	There must be a lot of green belt sites around Leek area as quoted by Leek Post and Times many times. So why take the risk of more traffic etc in this area. Its already been turned down because its a green belt area so what's changed?	See response to PO331
PO2413	Mrs S Hathaway				General comment	Totally agree with the objections, additional parking would be a bigger issue.	Comment noted
PO2439	Mrs C Atkinson				General comment	To add further drainage of this site is a huge concern our gardens back onto the proposed development and naturally draws away into this site so what would happen becomes a concrete slab! Also as well as the noise/light pollution what about the wildlife and the extra pollution with regards to access to the development if 2 exits and 2 entrances we on mill brook this would make our very small estate a rat run for this proposed development.	See response to PO331
PO2324	Ms V Pegg				Support	I fully endorse all the comments and objections listed above. In addition from a personal point of view I have enjoyed the quiet rural beauty of this site for nearly 30 yrs. My peace and tranquility would be displaced by the development of this site. CD115 and CD015 as brownfield site alternatives have my support for development.	See response to PO20134 and PO331
PO2350	Mrs P Kelsall				General comment	Cheddleton should not be merged with Wetley Rocks.	See response to PO331
PO2393	Mrs P Kelsall				General comment	I have safety concerns on the A520. I had a accident there in broad daylight in 1982 and was never able to continue with my complete employment.	See response to PO331
PO2348	Mr M Cunningham				General comment	I support the development of the brown field site of Staffordshire Farmers and Heath House Farm land.	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2473	Mrs O Thorley				General	I have attended local meeting as I have become aware that there are	See response to P0331

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
					comment	other areas of land that would offer a significantly lower level of, safety of residents in this neighbourhood must be paramount in any planning considerations as detailed above, this proposed site would be hazardous to residents (even more so than the current levels of danger).	
PO2471	Mr M Thorley				General comment	It would surely make sense to look at alternative sites for development eg CD115, and CD015, Building on these sites would do more to connect the 2 sections of Cheddleton village . Building on the CD002 and CD003 would effectively connect Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks as building at the other side of the A520 in Wetley Rocks. Thus creating urban sprawl.	See response to PO2034
PO2445	Mrs P Kelsall				General comment	I agree with the governments policy to protect green belt land.	Comment noted
PO2499	Mrs P Kelsall				General comment	I object to the properties being built on green belt land when there are brown field sites recommended by the Parish Council.	See response to PO2034 & P0331
PO2469	Mr And Mrs RJ/S Morris				General comment	Preferred sites CD115, CD015 & CD030	See response to PO2034 & PO2425
PO2316 PO2495 PO2443 PO2399	Mr. Martyn Findlow Mr. Martyn Findlow Mr. Martyn Findlow Mr ML Edwards				General comment	Preferred sites: CD030 Rockend Farm, CD069a & CD116.	- See response to PO2034 & PO2425 - CD069a is within the village boundary and can be developed as infill - CD116 was classed a C in the SHLAA and was therefore not considered suitable for development
PO4889	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Support	Submits report [attached] on behalf of owner of land immediately east of preferred option CD017, promoting that land as residential preferred option as part of CD017: argues client's land makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and is therefore suitable for development [includes comparison of client's land against Council preferred options as per GB purposes]; client's site will have less of an impact on the Green Belt than the preferred options sites CD02 and CD03, as well as the reserved site CD019. Client's land coupled with site CD017 therefore represents the least harmful option available site also constitutes previously developed land, as it is used for equestrian purposes; argues housing site options methodology applied to options/preferred options sites is flawed [introduction of new sites/re-consideration of existing 'C' sites etc]. Site CD019 is not suitable [ribbon development/infilling];	The sites are in the Green Belt and are not well related to the built up area. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO107	Mr John Clarke				Object	Traveller site Blythe Bridge This site in my opinion is contrary to the general guidelines that are adhered to nationally. It is a clear interference with neighbouring properties in that area. Travellers if given a free choice of land on which to reside would not choose land that is closely occupied by built up residences that have been occupied by neighbours for some time previously. Speaking to the land owner and his wife they in actuality have no intention of selling this land at all, for development of housing, commercial or traveller site. Their feelings and intentions should be considered primarily, any attempt to compulsory purchase this land would be resisted by a substantial number of rate-payers and should not be considered on moral grounds.	See response to question 40.
PO207	Mrs Jacqueline Leach				General comment	There has been little focus on tourism in Cresswell and Draycott. This will have less impact on roads but provide employment opportunities. No negotiations are going ahead between SMDC and Stoke City as was previously stated. There are alternative sites available such as units just off the A50 near Grindley Lane. These have far better access than Cresswell has to the A50. So many brown field sites are available in the City but SMDC are concentrating on the money side of things rather than common sense.	- The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area. - There are policies in the Local Plan regarding development in the countryside and the rural economy
PO1039	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Object	Stoke on Trent City Council have many brown field sites that they wish to develop with employment opportunities and housing opportunities. many residents in Stoke-on-Trent and other urban areas have used the Staffordshire Moorlands for recreational purposes. This should remain and the main focus for the Staffordshire Moorlands should be safeguarding the Green Belt, the Greenfield sites and the Special Landscape Areas for future generations to enjoy. Preservation of wild life and protected species and the development of tourism. Why should this area become Urbanised when the urbanised areas we already have around the city of Stoke-on-Trent are in great need of financial support to achieve this. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council have not worked WITH Stoke-City-Council, quite the opposite they have worked entirely for themselves and to make money from housing and employment development without consulting any local people and the needs they require.	- The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area. - National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the Districts housing requirement is met. - Residents' views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO1034	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Object	Once again Cresswell is NOT listed and any affordable housing built will not necessarily be allocated to local people as is needed. We have been told that Cresswell is NOT a preferred site by planning officers yet the planning committee ignored the recommendation for refusal of one of SMDC's planning officers regarding flooding, contamination, inadequate infrastructure and no sustainability as doctors, schools, dentists etc have to be reached by car.	Comments noted
PO203	Mrs Jacqueline				Object	168 houses in Cresswell not included on here. SMD/2014/0576 Disgraceful. Again Cresswell is a hamlet NOT a small village	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Leach					therefore the application should never have been passed as it was linked in with OC055 as a mixed development. Goes against NPPF AND SMDC Core Strategy. Also under police investigation at the moment. Should be suspended.	
PO9745	Not known Scentarea Ltd Not known	Scentarea Ltd	Ms Rosie Cotterill		Object	Covering letter and map submitted [refer to PO9731 attachments] supporting Preferred Options employment site OC055, and additionally proposing that adjacent land be allocated for housing: The intention of the proposed approved employment/housing approval SMD/2014/0576 is to create a sustainable addition to Cresswell by expanding a successful business park and bolstering the provision of residential dwellings, including much needed affordable housing. The proposed development will also be beneficial for the wider District providing housing and employment land to meet an identified need. as this permission has already granted industrial development on OC055 site, Scentarea Ltd therefore fully supportive of the Council's intention to allocate this site There are a number of existing businesses on the site who are committed to growing in this location once larger employment units have been developed and are available. Scentarea also often receives enquiries from other businesses looking to move to the site who, without the development of new units, cannot currently be accommodated. Given that western portion SMD/2014/0576 has already been granted residential planning permission, it would seem logical that the western portion of the site is also allocated for residential development. This will help meet the housing need identified in the adopted Core Strategy in line with para 47 NPPF. The site is not in the Green Belt and would therefore allow for the Council to meet some of their identified need on non-Green Belt land. The Environmental Impact Assessment submitted in support of the planning application demonstrates that there are no environmental constraints on site restricting development which could not be overcome through mitigation.	Support noted. The land to the west of OC055 has been granted planning permission for residential development and is counted as a commitment for the Local Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company /Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4717	Mr Michael Bamford	Planning Design			General comment	Agent (on behalf of landowner) reiterates representations submitted to 2015 Options consultation; namely a supporting letter proposing a wider infill boundary for Dilhorne than proposed; a 2015 Options response form (proposing this, and also a site for housing south of School Lane), a SHLAA form and a map of this site. Refer to attachments to PO4716.	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages. Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan. The Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages. Limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis policy in the Local Plan. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9128	Bev Reardon				Object	Cumulative Impact of Proposed Northern Gateway Site, Proposed Traveller Site and BB041 and OC055. I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041 (Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and	- National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on highways and school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. - If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

						Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house. I have spoken to residents groups in Leek who say they would welcome industrial parks and associated housing as they want to offer 'local jobs' to help with the ongoing, very successful regeneration of Leek . No one from SMDC has yet explained why no developments of the size planned for Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell have been proposed for Leek. No one from SMDC has explained why almost 80% of the district allocation for housing and industrial parks is being sited at Cresswell, Draycott and Blythe Bridge. No one from SMDC has explained why there is no allocation for a Traveller Site at Leek, there is clearly a demand for this, as unofficial traveller sites and occupation of land from the travelling community is not uncommon in Leek. I request that all of the above objections- and points within this objection document to be considered fully.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO3903	Mr J Silitlitoe				EN012	Object	Additional houses on this site would impact adversely on the flow of traffic volume on the estate and consequently on our access to the A53. The junction at the bottom of Hillswood Drive is hazardous at present and will become more so with increased traffic. The site together with adjacent to me, is an important soakaway for the estate, building on it will impact on the flooding issues, already causing problems. The roads on the estate are not suitable for increased traffic flow.	- Hillswood Drive terminates at the gated entrance to this site. This access also leads to a playground. An extension to the adopted highway should be feasible at this point and this may be the best way to obtain access - Potential flood risk issues, will require flood risk assessment/modelling and early engagement with County Council & Environment Agency
PO3904	Mr J Silitlitoe				EN012	Object	Any large scale development in Endon must address the flooding issues, currently being discussed with the Nation Flood Forum. The major junction at Station Road/Clay Lake must be resigned to cope with additional traffic – this is a hazardous junction and will become more so with increased traffic. Any development without solving these problems will be insensitive and lacking any common sense.	See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding
PO9465	Mr John Proffitt				EN012	Object	Email submitted 03/06/16: I am making contact to offer my support for the proposed Alternative option for the future housing projects in Endon Village. The initial proposal to use land opposite the Playing field at the top of Hillswood Drive would have the most negative effect on the functioning on this sector of Endon. Hillswood Drive is already a very busy road, especially at the times when parents are travelling through the estate to drop off or pick up their children from Endon Hall Primary School. During Winter when we have snow and ice (even with salting) Hillswood Drive becomes precarious if not a risky venture..... any additional traffic would only make things far more dangerous. Additionally, the initial proposal would mean traffic passing close to the access to the playing fields..which could add risk to the children using this facility. The alternative option looks far more balanced... this part of Endon is much less congested with fewer houses less traffic and much better access to the main A53.	See response to PO3903 regarding highways
PO9498	Mr Paul Stevens				EN012	Object	Email submitted objecting to Preferred Options site EN012 (and other sites): First of all I would like to state that I'm in favour of the alternative plans that are about to be submitted by the Endon with Stanley Parish council. I find the Staffordshire Moorlands plans ludicrous for the following reasons; The four fields on our estate (EN012,EN007,EN019 & EN101) are all Green Belt area's - question doesn't this mean anything anymore and if not why was it granted in the first place. I appreciate that only site EN012 has been given approval so far but question what's to stop the remaining 3 "Amber" fields from being granted the same permission. We currently have severe issues with drains and garden flooding (Exacerbated over the last couple of years). So, with the possibility of an extra 131 houses question what's going to be done to solve this ever increasing problem. Thirdly,	- See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding - The land in question is within the Green Belt The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. It

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							what's going to be done about the substantial increase in traffic. The junction at the bottom of Hillswood Drive is an accident waiting to happen. Cars are left at the bottom of Hillswood Drive within metres of the junction resulting in reduced width of the road. Turning left is treacherous (With the pedestrian crossing approximately 10 metres to the left of the junction) and turning right at busy times is near on impossible!!!! Finally, I'm lead to believe that a third of these will be Social or Affordable housing. Surely this will lead to a drastic reduction in the values of property within the area and significant negative changes to the wonderful village life we currently enjoy and pay for the privilege of. A very concerned and disappointed resident.	found the site's overall impact on Green Belt's purposes were moderate. " Whilst progressive extension of the built edge into open countryside is not ideal, there is in this case the opportunity to use a reasonable boundary feature as the clear extent of development in a location which not readily visible. These sites would need to be the subject of comprehensive masterplanning to ensure that the treatment of the outer edge is properly addressed, and built development does not extend to the north of the current open space." It considered the site could be considered for release under Exceptional Circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. • Property values are not a material planning consideration • The Local Plan will allocate sites for residential development and will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. • As part of the preparation for the emerging Local Plan the Council has assessed sites in the SHLAA and sites suggested through the consultation process. The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
								Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website
PO9443	MR ANDREW RENNIE				EN012	Object	Email with comments form submitted objecting to Preferred Options site EN012. Comments form: EN012 Infrastructure Schools- I am not sure how many children outside the Endon Schools catchment areas attend each of the three schools so I am not in a position to comment on their capacity or ability to take additional children from within the area. Infrastructure Traffic & Transport & Carbon Footprint. I have recently taken part in a traffic survey (the results of which are held by Parish Councillor Joe Porter) at the junction of the A53 Leek Road , Station Road Endon , the B5051 to and from Brown Edge and Hillswood Drive Endon.From the results of the survey it is clear that the junction which feeds three roads onto the A53 is not capable of handling any additional vehicles from the proposed development EN012. Traffic using the junction from Station Road entrance often goes straight across the junction towards Brown Edge which leads to a build up of because it is has to cross both lanes of traffic. If the proposed development site EN012 were to be approved as a suitable site it would make the A53 junction unfit for purpose and pose a health and safety hazard from the dangers of traffic, noise and air pollution to not just the local dwellings but also to the children who walk this way to school each day. Any proposed development on site EN012 would increase the vehicle volumes by at least twice the number of proposed dwellings on the site because the occupiers would have to travel at least ten miles per day either south to Stoke-On-Trent or north to Leek and the Moorlands to find suitable employment which was capable of servicing debt finance on the property. Quality employment paying reasonable salaries to service debt finance to purchase homes within the Stoke-On-Trent / Leek area is very difficult to find so occupiers of the properties will have to travel larger distances thereby increasing the carbon footprint of the Endon area and damaging the environment. Surely the longer term view should be to locate more homes closer to where the employment is rather than spreading it far and wide? Infrastructure Other: At present Endon has one village shop/ store with another being built on the A53 which was formerly a car garage, one petrol filling station with a snack shop, one chemist shop, one doctors surgery, one hairdressers, two public houses with eating facilities and one hearing aid centre and a crèche for young children two churches and one village hall. I understand the Doctors Surgery is registered to its full capacity and unable to take additional patients to its register. The parking facilities at the village stores are limited and the size of the shop and range of products is limited. No doubt the Coop store being	• New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • The Core Strategy defines Endon as a larger village with a range of facilities and services • The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations The Study found the eastern section of the site is of medium landscape sensitivity. Site-specific landscape mitigation measures for this section could include additional advanced planting on the northern boundary. The western section of the site is of high landscape sensitivity.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							built will address the parking and limitations of the village store but this will add even more strain to the A53 junction I eluded to in the first paragraph because more local people will drive to the Coop store rather than walking to the village store. Added to which the entrance and exit to this store will be extremely dangerous during school closing times. The location of Site EN012 is unsuitable because it is situated at the top of hill which means occupiers will inevitably resort to vehicular transport because of the steepness of the hill. It is unfriendly to disabled users and people with breathing difficulties. Because of the proposed proximity of the site it is often exposed to the worst of the inclement weather on the prevailing westerly winds being at the top of the hill. During the winter months when snow is lying for days and weeks people are unable to get to the top of High View Road by vehicle because the road and pavements are not on the core gritting routes this can lead to emergency services not being able to access residents. Any development on the proposed site EN012 would add to these current problems. Also I don't think the drain infrastructure in the Endon area will be able to cope with any increased demand from a proposed development. Landscape- The Landscape on the proposed development site EN012 is a sloping field on a gradient running down from Endon Bank Farm towards Hillswood Drive Playing Field. These fields including the trees which surround them act as sponge reducing the run off of surface water to the lower levels of Endon. The views from site EN012 are rural looking over towards Rushton and Macclesfield in one direction and over to Lask Edge in the south westerly direction. These views are beautiful and uninterrupted, but equally are the views if you walk up Holehouse Lane and look back towards Endon where at present you can barely see the top of any properties in High View Road from any point as you walk up Holehouse Lane. If a proposed development were to go ahead on site EN 101 it would break the vista not just from Endon looking outwards but also from the immediate countryside looking inwards towards Endon. Surely we should be looking to protect this site for future dairy farming which will help secure local employment and reduce our carbon footprint? Nature Conservation - The proposed site EN012 would have serious implications for the local wildlife. The site has trees which are of the old British hardwood types and are used by the following birds: Peregrine Falcons, Kestrels, Buzzard, Sparrow Hawk, Owls, Woodpeckers and Lapwing on the soaked parts of the field during early spring. The birds of prey are attracted by the food supply of field mice, voles, weasels and other mammals which use the site, foxes, and badgers are also attracted by the pheasants which frequent the field. Flood Risk- Endon has a long history of flooding and its associated problems. As I mentioned in the landscape paragraph Site EN012 acts as a natural sponge relieving the run off of surface water from the	• The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that “ <i>the site has mostly low biodiversity value overall in terms of area though the dry ditch to the east adds some extra biodiversity to the site.</i>” • New housing schemes (depending on their size) will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links. • An assessment of the District’s employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need. • Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district’s full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District’s proposed housing requirements so green field options have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy • As part of the preparation for the emerging Local Plan the Council has assessed sites in the SHLAA and sites suggested through the consultation process. The Council has considered the

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							upper levels. EN012 is at the top of four proposed development sites which could be enhanced with further trees to reduce surface water run off. If any proposed development took place on site EN012 then further consequences would be felt at lower levels because not matter what additional drains are put in the water has to run down bank somewhere causing more problems for people living lower down the estate and by the main road. You only have to look at the amount of times the A53 is being dug up from the Station Road junction to past Endon School to realise there are problems underground and these are a consequence of ground movement because of flooding. If you look in the history books of the local area Endon is always featured in the flood articles. If you walk from site EN101 to EN 012 in the middle of winter after snow has just melted you will witness how much of a sponge site EN012 actually is. The existing drainage system would not be capable of handling any resulting additional capacity. Amenity: Site EN012 would involve loss of light and privacy to the homes on High View Road but there are wider implications for the whole estate because the noise from increased traffic and people accessing the dwellings through the estate by vehicle would increase, and cause damage to air quality and noise levels on a permanent basis. In addition to the adult amenities there are also children amenities with the site EN012 as it exists because although it is private farmland local children use these fields as part of their habitat even though they maybe trespassing for such activities as sledging hide & seek and getting conkers in the autumn. Losing such an amenity would be damaging to the young children who can wander in a safe environment where there are no roads! Scale of Development: Any kind of development if it is absolutely necessary should be of a limited nature with low height buildings restricted to one level with a height restriction thus minimising any impact on the existing dwellings in High View Road and having minimum impact on the vista. Any large scale development would cripple the existing highway network system, deteriorate health and safety with noise and pollution and could not be handled by the local infrastructure as it stands. Government Policy: There is a government policy to build more housing to meet expected future demand. The demand for housing in the Endon area will be determined by sustainable employment opportunities within the local area. The local area in this context is Leek and Stoke for a reasonable long term employment period. These two area's are still going through a slow re-building process before quality sustainable employment opportunities become available. You have to get the employment in place first and then address the housing needs. The former is only in it's infancy as evidenced by the number of long term unsold existing properties on the estate adjacent to site EN012. The addition of further properties at the site EN012	alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							would only exasperate the problem further which is what happened on a similar site on the edge of Shaftsbury Wiltshire where the cheap affordable housing was sold and taken up by people who did not care about the local people and area (with increased crime) and the dwellings which were built similar to the estate were left empty and could not be sold because there were no local quality employment opportunities. If affordable Social Housing needs to be built it should built closer to the existing employment opportunities Stoke & Leek thus minimising carbon footprint and focussing population growth closer to the amenities and infrastructure. The Government policy is to encroach onto greenbelt land only when absolutely necessary however just because a particular greenbelt site is beyond a village signpost does not mean that site is not less suitable than a site within a village boundary. A more suitable site which adjoins the A 53 just beyond the village sign post has been removed from the proposed site allocations because it did not come within the village boundary and was adjacent to a flood risk area. This site should be reviewed again because it is on the flat and is directly accessible from the A53 making vehicular access safer with less impact on the traffic junction I surveyed. Immediately opposite this site is a horticultural nursery with Polly tunnels so it is difficult to see how developing the other site would extend the village boundary when the nursery already exists. Other: Because of the slow employment rebuilding process in the Stoke & Leek area's many younger generations have left the Endon area to seek quality employment elsewhere. Endon is therefore becoming an elderly community which has specific housing needs. Building housing on Site EN012 at the top of an existing housing estate is not the solution. If affordable social housing needs to built it needs to be built away from site EN012 possibly opposite the poly tunnels site beyond the Endon village sign, which means the Endon village sign could be moved a few hundred yards to bring the site into the village along with the Nursery! Existing brownfields sites should be considered such as the disused railway running beyond Endon Station through to Stockton Brook this will never be brought back into use because the track and infrastructure between Endon and Stoke-on-Trent is in such a state beyond repair that it will never be used again. This land should be acquired from Network Rail and Moorland Railways and used for residential development in the Endon area. Further email comments: I understand one of the sites listed above EN012 has been designated a green status (draft potential allocations) and the other sites EN007,EN019 & EN101 have been designated amber (draft reserve sites) for the time being. It would be helpful to know why the only Draft Reserve Sites (Amber) are the only sites in the Endon area which have been designated this status when no other sites have been given this designation. I wish to continue to object regarding allocating	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							any of these sites for development for the reasons outlined in the attached original consultation documents but additionally from the Infrastructure Highways point of view. Both the road way and road footpath's on and surrounding the existing estate are not capable of taking any further increase in traffic. Today 6th June 2016 was the first day back from half term holidays and I gave my wife a lift to work to Hanley and it took me five minutes to get a clear slot to leave Hillside Avenue and join the main A53 Leek Road at 7:20 AM this morning. If any major scale development took place at the top of the existing estate the whole junction would become grid locked and that is in fair weather conditions. The highways infrastructure is not fit for purpose which combined with the flooding issues on the existing estate should be the main reasons why the above sites should be removed from the local plan altogether. In addition I understand a site adjacent to Hallwater which would link both the old village to	
PO9480	Mr Karl Mansfield				EN012	Object	Email with response form submitted objecting to Preferred Options site EN012: The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the village. It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as 'soak away.' The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007. At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today. We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The	• See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding landscape, recreational land, site assessments and wildlife • See response to PO9498 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction. At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either 'green' or 'amber'. We note that all sites in Bagnall, Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015). Please bear in mind the current problems with access to Hillswood Drive during icy conditions, due to width, road surface and the fact it is not prioritised in terms of gritting. We have been unable to get to work on a number of occasions. Cars have veered off the road onto pavements when children have been walking home from school. The width of the road is already an issue. We feel that it is beneficial to the health and wellbeing of the village's children that the playing field should adjoin green belt land rather than be surrounded by houses, concrete, tarmac and cars. At the moment, this is a peaceful place for dog walkers, children and parents, walkers enjoying nature and those using the newly installed "Green Gymn".	
PO1949	Mr Frank Poole				EN012	Object	I am very concerned that any additional building in the Endon area will add to a flooding problem, which is already significant. The Staffordshire Moorlands Authority is already aware of this problem as detailed in your Level 1 SFRA report dated October 2015. Section 4.6.1 states : "18 records (of floods) between 1997 and 2012 are shown in Endon along Leek Road, of which 8 incidents occurred in 2012". I am aware of past flooding difficulties on the High View Estate, which can only be increased if the planned development takes place on sections EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101. I was present at a Parish Council meeting when the flooding on the High View were discussed with Staffordshire Moorlands representatives and to my knowledge these problems have not been resolved. The Endon Village has particular problems, being situated at the lowest point in the area, which is dissected by a brook, prone to overflowing its banks. In my view any development in Endon, without major investment to improve the main drains, will have an adverse affect on the Village. Inadequate drainage systems leads to flooding on Leek Road adjacent to Endon High School, this problem is increased because of significant water run off from the high ground at the Stoney Lane end of Brookfield Road. At times the volume of water is such that stones and other debris are swept along Brookfield, adding to poor drainage. I am concerned that additional building on section EN126 will significantly increase the current serious problems, because of additional dirty water entering the drains from new properties and surface water run off from an area, that currently acts as a soakaway. I also believe that additional water would be deposited on the Endon St Lukes School playing field, rendering it useless for a significant portion of the year. It is clear that the drainage system in Endon is inadequate and additional building	See response to PO3903 regarding flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							will increase the current serious problems. In March 2014 Nick Boles , Minister for Local Planning, stated in Parliament - "We are issuing robust guidelines on flood risk, making it crystal clear that councils need to consider strict tests set out in national policy and where they are not met new developments should not be allowed." I trust that appropriate members and officials of the Local Authority will accept responsibility should their decisions have an adverse affect on properties in the area, and in particular my own property.	
PO1953	Mr Phil Matthews				EN012	Object	I wish to strongly object to the proposal of 24 hours to be built on the EN012 site in Endon. I have lived in Endon all my life, living on the estate in question. The site under threat has a commanding position overlooking glorious views over the surrounding countryside. Currently the estate does not impose itself and therefore damage these views. This area was until very recently "Green Belt", yet not suddenly it's a "Green site" and a preferred site for development. There are many other sites which should be considered well ahead of EN012 which be less detrimental to the surrounding area. The Hillswood Drive/A53 junction is already extremely dangerous. For instance, Hillswood drive is steep, narrow, and has parked cars, making it unsuitable for further traffic. The farmland (EN012) and the other three fields have always been well farmed and being used for cattle grazing and silage making. Endon suffers with flooding with drains being connected to the storm water system which shouldn't be the case. Moreover, additional housing will cause even greater problems. Therefore, for the reasons stated, I urge you to reconsider your proposal.	• See response to PO9443 regarding landscape • See response to PO9438 regarding Green Belt and site options sites • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding assessment of previous sites
PO2919	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			EN012	General comment	In relation to Site EN012 intensification of traffic flows from this estate should be avoided without an improvement of junction onto A53. However, this plot on its own may be too small to facilitate this. Also both Hillside and Hillswood Avenue junctions are complicated as are Clay Lake and Church Lane onto the A53.	Comments noted
PO1941	Mrs Jane Ailsa Rennie				EN012	Object	Infrastructure Schools- I am not sure how many children outside the Endon Schools catchment areas attend each of the three schools so I am not in a position to comment on their capacity or ability to take additional children from within the area. Infrastructure Traffic & Transport & Carbon Footprint. I have recently taken part in a traffic survey (the results of which are held by Parish Councillor Joe Porter) at the junction of the A53 Leek Road , Station Road Endon , the B5051 to and from Brown Edge and Hillswood Drive Endon.From the results of the survey it is clear that the junction which feeds three roads onto the A53 is not capable of handling any additional vehicles from the proposed development EN012. Traffic using the junction from Station Road entrance often goes straight across the junction towards Brown Edge which leads to a build up of because it is has to cross both lanes of traffic. If the proposed development site EN012 were to be approved as a suitable site it would make	• See response to PO9443 regarding infrastructure, location/facilities, landscape, wildlife, need for houses, brownfield sites, residential amenity, site options sites and recreational use of site • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							the A53 junction unfit for purpose and pose a health and safety hazard from the dangers of traffic, noise and air pollution to not just the local dwellings but also to the children who walk this way to school each day. Any proposed development on site EN012 would increase the vehicle volumes by at least twice the number of proposed dwellings on the site because the occupiers would have to travel at least ten miles per day either south to Stoke-On-Trent or north to Leek and the Moorlands to find suitable employment which was capable of servicing debt finance on the property. Quality employment paying reasonable salaries to service debt finance to purchase homes within the Stoke-On-Trent / Leek area is very difficult to find so occupiers of the properties will have to travel larger distances thereby increasing the carbon footprint of the Endon area and damaging the environment. Surely the longer term view should be to locate more homes closer to where the employment is rather than spreading it far and wide? Infrastructure Other: At present Endon has one village shop/ store with another being built on the A53 which was formerly a car garage, one petrol filling station with a snack shop, one chemist shop, one doctors surgery, one hairdressers, two public houses with eating facilities and one hearing aid centre and a crèche for young children two churches and one village hall. I understand the Doctors Surgery is registered to its full capacity and unable to take additional patients to its register. The parking facilities at the village stores are limited and the size of the shop and range of products is limited. No doubt the Coop store being built will address the parking and limitations of the village store but this will add even more strain to the A53 junction I eluded to in the first paragraph because more local people will drive to the Coop store rather than walking to the village store. Added to which the entrance and exit to this store will be extremely dangerous during school closing times. The location of Site EN012 is unsuitable because it is situated at the top of hill which means occupiers will inevitably resort to vehicular transport because of the steepness of the hill. It is unfriendly to disabled users and people with breathing difficulties. Because of the proposed proximity of the site it is often exposed to the worst of the inclement weather on the prevailing westerly winds being at the top of the hill. During the winter months when snow is lying for days and weeks people are unable to get to the top of High View Road by vehicle because the road and pavements are not on the core gritting routes this can lead to emergency services not being able to access residents. Any development on the proposed site EN012 would add to these current problems. Also I don't think the drain infrastructure in the Endon area will be able to cope with any increased demand from a proposed development. Landscape- The Landscape on the proposed development site EN012 is a sloping field on a gradient running down from Endon Bank Farm	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							towards Hillswood Drive Playing Field. These fields including the trees which surround them act as sponge reducing the run off of surface water to the lower levels of Endon. The views from site EN012 are rural looking over towards Rushton and Macclesfield in one direction and over to Lask Edge in the south westerly direction. These views are beautiful and uninterrupted, but equally are the views if you walk up Holehouse Lane and look back towards Endon where at present you can barely see the top of any properties in High View Road from any point as you walk up Holehouse Lane. If a proposed development were to go ahead on site EN 101 it would break the vista not just from Endon looking outwards but also from the immediate countryside looking inwards towards Endon. Surely we should be looking to protect this site for future dairy farming which will help secure local employment and reduce our carbon footprint? Nature Conservation - The proposed site EN012 would have serious implications for the local wildlife. The site has trees which are of the old British hardwood types and are used by the following birds: Perrigin Falcons, Kestrels, Buzzard, Sparrow Hawk, Owls, Woodpeckers and Lapwing on the soaked parts of the field during early spring. The birds of prey are attracted by the food supply of field mice, voles, weasels and other mammals which use the site, foxes, and badgers are also attracted by the pheasants which frequent the field. Flood Risk- Endon has a long history of flooding and its associated problems. As I mentioned in the landscape paragraph Site EN012 acts as a natural sponge relieving the run off of surface water from the upper levels. EN012 is at the top of four proposed development sites which could be enhanced with further trees to reduce surface water run off. If any proposed development took place on site EN012 then further consequences would be felt at lower levels because not matter what additional drains are put in the water has to run down bank somewhere causing more problems for people living lower down the estate and by the main road. You only have to look at the amount of times the A53 is being dug up from the Station Road junction to past Endon School to realise there are problems underground and these are a consequence of ground movement because of flooding. If you look in the history books of the local area Endon is always featured in the flood articles. If you walk from site EN101 to EN 012 in the middle of winter after snow has just melted you will witness how much of a sponge site EN012 actually is. The existing drainage system would not be capable of handling any resulting additional capacity. Amenities: Site EN012 would involve loss of light and privacy to the homes on High View Road but there are wider implications for the whole estate because the noise from increased traffic and people accessing the dwellings through the estate by vehicle would increase, and cause damage to air quality and noise levels on a permanent basis. In addition to the adult amenities there are	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							also children amenities with the site EN012 as it exists because although it is private farmland local children use these fields as part of their habitat even though they maybe trespassing for such activities as sledging hide & seek and getting conkers in the autumn. Losing such an amenity would be damaging to the young children who can wander in a safe environment where there are no roads! Scale of Development: Any kind of development if it is absolutely necessary should be of a limited nature with low height buildings restricted to one level with a height restriction thus minimising any impact on the existing dwellings in High View Road and having minimum impact on the vista. Any large scale development would cripple the existing highway network system, deteriorate health and safety with noise and pollution and could not be handled by the local infrastructure as it stands. Government Policy: There is a government policy to build more housing to meet expected future demand. The demand for housing in the Endon area will be determined by sustainable employment opportunities within the local area. The local area in this context is Leek and Stoke for a reasonable long term employment period. These two area's are still going through a slow re-building process before quality sustainable employment opportunities become available. You have to get the employment in place first and then address the housing needs. The former is only in it's infancy as evidenced by the number of long term unsold existing properties on the estate adjacent to site EN012. The addition of further properties at the site EN012 would only exasperate the problem further which is what happened on a similar site on the edge of Shaftsbury Wiltshire where the cheap affordable housing was sold and taken up by people who did not care about the local people and area (with increased crime) and the dwellings which were built similar to the estate were left empty and could not be sold because there were no local quality employment opportunities. If affordable Social Housing needs to be built it should built closer to the existing employment opportunities Stoke & Leek thus minimising carbon footprint and focussing population growth closer to the amenities and infrastructure. The Government policy is to encroach onto greenbelt land only when absolutely necessary however just because a particular greenbelt site is beyond a village signpost does not mean that site is not less suitable than a site within a village boundary. A more suitable site which adjoins the A 53 just beyond the village sign post has been removed from the proposed site allocations because it did not come within the village boundary and was adjacent to a flood risk area. This site should be reviewed again because it is on the flat and is directly accessible from the A53 making vehicular access safer with less impact on the traffic junction I surveyed. Immediately opposite this site is a horticultural nursery with Polly tunnels so it is difficult to see	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							how developing the other site would extend the village boundary when the nursery already exists. Other: Because of the slow employment rebuilding process in the Stoke & Leek area's many younger generations have left the Endon area to seek quality employment elsewhere. Endon is therefore becoming an elderly community which has specific housing needs. Building housing on Site EN012 at the top of an existing housing estate is not the solution. If affordable social housing needs to be built it needs to be built away from site EN012 possibly opposite the poly tunnels site beyond the Endon village sign, which means the Endon village sign could be moved a few hundred yards to bring the site into the village along with the Nursery! Existing brownfields sites should be considered such as the disused railway running beyond Endon Station through to Stockton Brook this will never be brought back into use because the track and infrastructure between Endon and Stoke-on-Trent is in such a state beyond repair that it will never be used again. This land should be acquired from Network Rail and Moorland Railways and used for residential development in the Endon area.	
PO3901	Mrs S Silitiitoe				EN012	Object	Loss of visual open space – current dwelling in High View road and Spinney Close are below sky line and further improvements will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be visible from several directions. Planning had been refused on these grounds in the past significant impact on wildlife native species of trees at risk.	• See response to PO9442 regarding landscape and wildlife • The previous planning application refusal was under the existing planning policy at the time the consultation is on proposals to update planning policy and provide a new Local Plan
PO1954	Ros Benson				EN012	Object	My comments relate to site ref EN012. I am writing on behalf of my father who lives at 50 Hillswood Drive, adjacent to the field proposed for development. Although he appreciates that folk have to live somewhere, there are several problems that must be addressed: a the land needs to be properly drained b the junction of Hillswood Drive with the A53 is heavily congested at most times during the day and especially between 8 and 9 am and between 2.30 and 6.00pm. It is very difficult to turn right and one can wait many minutes before a suitable gap appears in the traffic from not only the A53 but also from Clay Lake and Station Road. A roundabout would help solve the problem which could only be made worse by more traffic from extra houses c could the schools cope with extra children? Hillside Avenue is clogged as it is with cars and coaches at both ends of the school day. d are there also brown field sites that could be used for building houses and unused old mills in the Leek area which could be made into flats?	• See response to PO3903 regarding flooding and highways • See response PO9443 regarding Infrastructure and brownfield sites
PO8997	Mr Christopher Hassall				EN012		Please find attached my objections to proposals to allow housing to be built at the top of Hillswood Drive (EN012). This land is not suitable for such development and the roads and drains are not able to cope with additional usage. The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat	• See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9438 regarding previous consultation sites and assessments sites • See response to PO9443 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the village .It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as 'soak away.' The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007 .At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today .We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction .At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either 'green'	landscape, wildlife and loss of recreational land and site assessments

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							or' amber'. We note that all sites in Bagnall , Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. 'The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015) Please note that all my previous objections are still applicable. Thank you for your response.	
PO5942	Mrs M Duffy				EN012	Object	Response form objecting to EN012 attached: there appears to be a "lemming like" dash to build properties within SMDC when Government projections show a requirement of some 50% less [housing] than SMDC proposals. Objective seems to be based on Government [financial] support. Latest figures show thousands houses up for sale and lying empty in SMD. The choice of En012 was undoubtedly chosen with easy access to Hillswood Drive. It is obvious that no survey was carried out prior to the decision by the SMDC; otherwise the following factors would have been raised as doubts about its potential as a development. Allegedly as being flat and rough. In fact apart from that a narrow strip to the top left side of the main field it slopes in 3 directions forming a bowl (see drawing) with 1 in 3 gradients. It is green belt and is	• See response to PO9443 regarding the need for houses and infrastructure • See response to PO9498 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO3903 regarding flooding and highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							used during the summer months for cattle grazing. There is two active land drains situated lower centre of the main field which protrudes out of the ground (see drawing) the lower drain runs into a troughs supplying the cattle there drinking water, during rainy conditions both drains feed the bottom of the field and into a culvert. The culvert is known to flood in adverse conditions affecting several properties adjacent to the culvert. The sub soil in the areas is clay with a high elasticity level (from a private survey done in 1997) the property rebuild required the use of piles because of land slip. Any roads or properties built on the EN012 together with any major movement of earth and clay will without doubt cause an increase of water into the culvert. To cope with this situation the culvert had to be rebuilt. Please note it passes under Houston Avenue and then through the estate down the main road. There is a number of objections which include Hillswood Drive traffic congestion, local schooling facilities etc. etc. etc. which have been ignored totally. Drs Practices are full together with schools.	
PO9526	Mrs Sylvia Matthews				EN012	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN012: questions why Green Belt status of site amended and therefore under threat of housing. Quotes Green Belt Review findings, and NPPF. There are far more suitable sites than this site. Estate not extend since 1960s to not impact on prominent views. Decision makers may have not visited site. All other possible sites such as EN030, EN108, EN092 should be looked at. Question why not considered. Housing on those sites would not have same damaging impact. Sites EN033/EN126 more suitable for social housing. Brookfield Avenue site would have easy access onto A53. EN012 - long narrow steep estate road is unsuitable for the extra volume of traffic. Hillswood Drive/A53 junction is a nightmare, dangerous.[Sites EN030, EN108, EN092 would have safer access onto A523]. Sites EN007/012/019/101 have always been used for grazing or silage. Well managed, valuable agricultural land. Endon suffers flooding problems. Endon Flood Forum has identified that "Drains are connected to the stormwater system and shouldn't be. Additional housing will only cause greater problems".	- See response to PO9498 regarding Green Belt - As part of the preparation for the emerging Local Plan the Council has assessed sites in the SHLAA and sites suggested through the consultation process. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website
PO1301	Miss S Hackley				EN012	Object	roads are inadequate junction is inadequate and danergerous drainage is an issue road congestiion	See response to PO3903 regarding highways
PO4838					EN012	Object	Roads are to narrow, it's a accident waiting to happen at the junction if Hillswood Drive and Leek Road.	See response to PO3903 regarding highways
PO3902	Mrs S Silitlitoe				EN012	Object	Roads congested and estate roads too narrow Flooding issues in Endon are currently being addressed by the National Flood Forum. Fields above Hillswood Drive, High View Road are natural soakaway. Junction at Station Road/Claylake must be redesigned to deal with increased traffic volume. Designated green belt should Not be altered – there no need to encroach. Oversubscribed schools	- See response to PO3903 regarding highways traffic and flooding - See response to PO9498 regarding Green Belt - See response to PO9443 regarding infrastructure
PO2872	James	Spatial Planning Policy			EN012	Object	The allocation EN012 at Endon appears to project from the main	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Chadwick	Officer Staffordshire County Council					village envelope into the wider landscape with potential wider reaching effects. This is likely to require specific policy consideration within the Plan.	
PO1956	Mr Howard Kelsall				EN012	Object	The initial site assessment of the field EN012 contained some inaccuracies. It was stated that there are semi rural views from the field. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review the field EN012 is classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012 field acts as 'soak away.' The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007. At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today .We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision- making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 metres wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction .At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View	• See response to PO9498 regarding previous sites and assessments • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding landscape

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Estate, we are very disappointed that the identified site EN012 remains 'green'. We note that all sites in Bagnall , Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Please note that all my previous objections are still applicable.	
PO9001	Mrs Hayley Mansfield				EN012		The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the village .It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as 'soak away.' The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007 .At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today .We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston	• See response to PO9498 regarding previous sites and assessments • See response to PO3903 regarding flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding landscape, recreational use of site and wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction .At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either 'green' or 'amber'. We note that all sites in Bagnall , Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. 'The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015) Please bear in mind the current problems with access to Hillswood Drive during icy conditions, due to width, road surface and the fact it is not prioritised in terms of gritting. We have been unable to get to work on a number of occasions. Cars have veered off the road onto pavements when children have been walking home from school. The width of the road is already an issue. We feel that it is beneficial to the health and wellbeing of the village's children that the playing field should adjoin green belt land rather than be surrounded by houses, concrete, tarmac and cars. At the moment, this is a peaceful place for dog walkers, children and parents, walkers enjoying nature and those using the newly installed "Green Gymn". Please note that all my previous objections are still applicable. Thank you for your response.	
PO3890	Ms Valerie Harris				EN012	Object	The only access to this area would be from Stoney Lane which is on un-adapted roads; cars would still come down Brookfield Avenue to get to the A53 during school time the avenue is very busy with cars still parking there although there are parking notifications, other cars park on the roads at the top of Brookfield Avenue. This area also has problems with flooding. The residents are all against this proposal.	See response to PO3903 regarding highways
PO743	Mr Trevor Clarke				EN012	Object	There is already significant development in the area, with limited access to the proposed site, this will impact greatly on the road/ traffic from an already very busy A53.	See response to PO3903 highways
PO770	Mrs Dilys Clarke				EN012	Object	This area of Endon is already over-developed and further housing would only exacerbate the drainage, landscape and traffic problems.	- See response to PO3903 regarding flooding and highways - See response to PO9443 regarding landscape
PO1946	Ms Gillian Hassall				EN012	Object	This site is totally inappropriate for such development, it is water logged and the roads and drains in the area are unsuitable to cope with the extra usage. The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the	- See response to PO9498 regarding site assessments - See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO9443 regarding landscape, wildlife and recreational use of the site

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							village .It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as ‘soak away.’ The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007 .At present these culverts drain into pipes 9” diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960’s planning regulations and would not be allowed today .We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction .At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either ‘green’ or ‘amber’. We note that all sites in Bagnall , Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. 'The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015) Please note that all my previous objections are still applicable.	
PO580	Mr Douglas Martin				EN012	Object	Traffic problems. It is already difficult to exit from the area to the A53 in the mornings and at school opening and closing times. Extra housing will make the situation worse and more dangerous. Flooding. The drainage system is at times unable to cope with bad weather. In August 2012 several properties in Houston Avenue and Houston Avenue itself were flooded. Extra housing will make the situation worse.	See response to PO3903 regarding flooding and highways
PO3899	Mrs S Silitlito				EN012	Object	Traffic volumes on estate access roads (4.83m wide), which are already congested and consequent access to the A53 exacerbated. The junction at the bottom of Hillswood Drive is hazardous at present and will become more so with increased traffic (24 houses generate 24 + vehicles) safer routes' to schools will be compromised by increased pupils numbers and increased traffic.	See response to Po3903 regarding highways
PO1823					EN012	Object	The initial site assessment of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and	See response to PO9498 regarding previous

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1839	Mrs Shirley Sugars						EN012 contains several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a '@flat overgrown field' this is clearly not the case as the filed slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is 1 of the highest points in the village. It was stated that there are semi-rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from this field to the Roaches and Cheshire according to the green belt review 4 fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN108, areas which have been taken out any proposed site development are also classed as grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that En012, EN007, EN019, and EN101 fields act as a soakaway. The lane running from Endon bank farm is watershed for the estate. There are 3 culverts leading from EN101, EN019, and EN007. At present these culverts drain in to pipes 9" diameter which then runs under the estate. The field's drains are connected to storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960'd planning regulations and would not be allowed today. We know that 1 of these culverts in EN007 resulted in 1 property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on the fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process regarding these sites. A major concern for all the families living on the estate is safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon primary school. The roads are on the estate are only 4.83mtrs wide, barley enough for 2 cars to pass, especially on the corner. The estate is the major catchment area for the schools and other Endon Schools many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents have to travel further afield park on the footpaths with an obvious danger to the children and residents. The junction with the A53, hillside Avenue and church lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey as this school to behind the plough car park walk down church lane. At peak times this was 1 car every 10 seconds. Parents encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough Car Park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpaths in church lane in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath and the school traffic warden has had to help children and parents t cross both church lane and the A53. With a potential 131 more houses built on the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there has already been a traffic warden injured within the last 12mths. As residents of high view estate we are very disappointed that the 4 identified remain either green belt or	sites and site assessments and Green Belt • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding wildlife, landscape and loss of land used for recreation
PO1822	Mrs Wendy Taylor							
PO1841	mrs carolyn moore							
PO1840	Mr Michael Moore							
PO1842	Mr Peter Beresford							
PO1843	Mrs Beryl Beresford							
PO1832	Mr Brian Mills							
PO1831	Mrs Josephine Mills							
PO1851	Mrs Bev Ashley							
PO1838	Mrs Eileen Bate							
PO1837	Mr Terence Bate							
PO1835	Mr J.T. Flannigan							
PO1834	Mrs Betty Flannigan							
PO1824	Mr Scott Taylor							
PO1846	Mr Andrew Walley							
PO1836	Mrs Valerie Walley							
PO1853	Ms Claire Underwood							
PO1845	Mr Martin Underwood							
PO1825	Mr Philip N Wilcox							
PO1830	Mr E J Wetherhill							
PO1829	Mrs F E Wetherhill							
PO1820	Mr K Bate							
PO1821	Mrs Julie Bate							
PO1819	Mrs Natalie Biswas							
PO1827	Mr Daniel							

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1844 PO1818 PO1850 PO1826 PO1833 PO1849 PO1848 PO1847 PO1854 PO8999 PO1935	Roberts Mr C Ball Mrs L Ball Mrs D Leese Mr N Roberts Mrs V Machin Mr A Leese Miss L Leese Mr R Leese Mr G Machin Mr Charles Bennett Ms Anthea Marilyn Price						amber. We note that all the site sin bagnall, Stockton brook, or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the parish council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation process. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These 3 sites are all classed as grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village. Since the high view estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village and the newer part of the village. Any development to these would impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of high view estate are below the skyline. Any further developments will result in skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. It appears that the SMDC will allow urban development will allow urban development to take place in green field sites towards brown edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007, are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle and brown long eared bats. The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with the bat potential, in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and dry ditch that could be support the reptile populations warrant the site being attributed regional ecological importance (Staffordshire ecological records SER/15/427 – aug 2015) Pls note that all my previous objections are still applicable	
PO9453 PO9433 PO9488 PO9493 PO9504 PO9459 PO9512 PO9439	Mr Howard Broad Ms Yvonne St. Cyr Mrs Kim Bennett Mr Paul Matthews Mrs Sandra Broad Mr John Overend Mr Stanley Hurst Mr Thomas Bennett				EN012	Object	Email and response form submitted objecting to Preferred Options site EN012: The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the village .It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108, areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as 'soak away.' The	• See response to PO9498 regarding previous sites and site assessments • See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding wildlife, landscape and recreation use

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007 .At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today .We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision- making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction .At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either 'green' or 'amber'. We note that all sites in Bagnall , Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. 'The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015).	
PO9000 PO9506	Mrs Clare Poulton Mr Lee Poulton				EN012	Object	Development of this site would severely compromise highway safety along Hillswood Drive, particularly at the junction between Hillswood Drive and Leek Road. This junction is currently extremely difficult to use and indeed currently represents a real risk of road traffic collision. The resulting extra traffic would further increase the likelihood of vehicle collision and also pose a real danger for pedestrians (particularly children from the village who walk to local schools). Hillswood Drive and the surrounding roads are also not suitable for the range of large vehicles required to service any construction activity. In summary highway safety is an area I would expect the council to be promoting not disregarding. This site is within the greenbelt and development here should not be seen as an "easy option" rather than alternative brown field sites in surrounding authorities. Since there are no local employment opportunities this will create further harm to the environment due to the increased pollution from cars, etc. Local amenities are already stretched, particularly the doctors surgery, an influx of further residents would only seek to increase the pressure on these providers. Local schools have no capacity to accommodate an increase of this magnitude. Increased utility services, such as drainage and water supply, would add an extra burden to the existing aging pipeline network. The foul drainage system is already causing problems as it connects from Houston Avenue through Hillswood Drive, increased flow will no doubt make the issue worse. Proposed development of the site would have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities, namely the visual impact of said development, i.e. what it will be like to look at, not	• See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9438 regarding Green Belt • Site options • See response to PO9443 regarding infrastructure, landscape and residential amenity • See response to PO9443 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							necessarily the loss of a view. Development of the site would compromise the need to avoid town cramming. Residents in the surrounding area would likely suffer a loss of privacy and overlooking, in addition to overshadowing/loss of light. Open space vistas would be compromised, i.e. this is one of the highest places in Endon and once ruined future generations would undoubtedly be deprived of the obviously current benefits. The Parish Council has proposed an alternative range of sites which do NOT involve development here and I believe should be utilized.	
PO980 PO985 PO993	Mrs Hayley Sullivan Mr Michael Sullivan Mr Oliver Sullivan				EN012	Object	Housing Allocations I would like to record my view that there is a need for more houses across the whole of the UK and I appreciate that this can only be delivered through action by taken by local authorities in their Housing Strategies. I support the need to deliver more houses and in particular, more affordable housing. However, it is essential that this is delivered in a manner which supports the local area and can be supported by the local infrastructure. Endon is defined as a 'larger village' but has managed to retain much of the character of a village. The proposed site of EN012 (and most likely extending over time to EN007, EN019 and EN101 therefore providing 131 properties), will have a detrimental impact on the area as a village and the local infrastructure will be unable to support such a high number of additional properties / families. The scale of the proposed developments is far too great for this semi-rural village area. There are other sites in the Endon and surrounding area which should be developed before developing outside of the current development boundary. The approach should be to build in infill / windfall sites in brownfield areas, built in a manner which supports the current village footprint and which does not create even larger housing estates.	• See response to PO9443 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO9498 regarding site assessments • See response to PO9443 regarding the brownfield sites • Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan
PO9543 PO9544	Mr Peter Walker Mr J G Chetwin				EN012	Object	Letter attached to response form [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN012: The following factors raise doubts abouts site's suitability for development: Apart from narrow strip tio the top left, field slopes in three directions forming a bowl, with up to 1 in 3 gradients. Green Belt used in summer for grazing two active land drains in lower centre of field which protrude out of ground. One runs into cattle trough. During rainy conditions both drains feed excess water down field and into a culvert. this culvert is known to flood in adverse weather, affecting several adjacent properties. sub soil is high elasticity clay. [A property rebuild required piles because of land slip]. Any roads or properties built on site will cause increase of water into culvert. To cope, culvert would have to be rebuilt. Culvert passes under Houston Ave properties, through estate, down to main road. Other objections - Hillswood Drive traffic congestion, local school facilities etc.	• See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9498 regarding Green Belt
PO9546	Mrs Kathleen				EN012	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN012: Potential Plan sites	• See response to PO 9498 regarding site assessments

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9545	Dean Mr John Dean						EN007/EN012/EN019/EN101 is based on incorrect information and has not been informed by key facts relating to impact on flooding, traffic, rural vistas, greenbelt land and local wildlife. Field slopes significantly [is not flat] fields are not overgrown [cattle grazing] There is only one access point [not multiple points] There are completely undisturbed views [not semi-rural views]. There are issues with drainage and floodwater emanating from these fields. [Nearby] residences have been flooded on numerous occasions. Natural contours of these sites ends at a low point [near] 18 Houston Ave. A private culvert is subject to flooding. Additional housing on any of these sites will cause significant increase in not just volume of water but flow rates, causing flooding. The land being 'high plasticity clay' does not help situation. Traffic congestion/health and safety issues flooding rural vista/loss of light Green Belt / Special Scenic classification Wildlife key facilities within Endon are at capacity Preferred development areas - before any Green Belt land is reclassified in Endon all brownfield sites should be fully exhausted. My preference would be to have minimal impact to residents by considering EN130, site opposite it, EN125 etc first.	• See response to PO3903 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO9443 regarding landscape, wildlife, infrastructure and brownfield sites
PO3907	Mrs H Hatcher					Object	We object to the plans for Hillswood Drive for the same reasons of access problems and noise plus scale of the development (with no plans to enhance amenities of infrastructure). Also we are concerned about the type of development planned for the canal side sites – being a safe and secure, beautiful setting it would be at the risk of crime and disturbance should travellers or social housing be given approval. We have just had our property valued, should any development diminish the financial investment we have made we will take all this up with the council directly.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO254 regarding design and residential amenity • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO148 regarding property value

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO61	Ms Wendy Birks				General comment	I feel that the housing allocation for Endon (where I live) is appropriate at present.	Comments noted
PO2920	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Site EN033/EN126 will need to consider the Station Road/A53 junction.	Comments noted
PO746	Mr Trevor Clarke				Support	Ease of access and the proposed area would take development.	Comments noted
PO4839					Support	Easy to get out on to the main road.	Comments noted
PO665	MRS Melanie Thomas				Support	I consider this is suitable for development as the proposed capacity is low and a small development in this location would be well screened on 2 sides by existing housing and not highly visible from Post Lane, so would be fairly unobtrusive. It would also form a natural extension to existing residential development. This is a part of Endon which has experienced little new development in recent years, compared with more central areas of the village, and could accommodate increased housing. It is also in close proximity to local amenities on Station Road. Access, via Post Lane, would be on a stretch of road with current low volumes of traffic. Also, due to the hump-backed bridge/traffic lights, vehicles travelling in both directions do so at reduced speeds which should limit road safety issues.	Comments noted
PO747	MR Joseph Thomas						
PO705	MR Ray Austin						
PO739	MR David Thomas						
PO742	MR James Thomas						
PO715	Miss Beth Thomas						
PO761	Mrs Dilys Clarke				Support	The site is suitable for development and would easily accommodate the number of houses proposed. Access is easily available. The development would have less impact on the local surroundings compared to other proposals.	Comments noted
PO709	MR Kevin Thomas				Support	I consider this is suitable for development as the proposed capacity is low and a small development in this location would be well screened on 2 sides by existing housing and not highly visible from Post Lane, so would be fairly unobtrusive. It would also form a natural extension to existing residential development. This part of Endon has experienced little new development in recent years, compared to more central areas of the village, and could accommodate increased housing. It is also in close proximity to local amenities on Station Road. Access, via Post Lane, would be on a stretch of road with current low volumes of traffic. Also, due to the hump-backed bridge/traffic lights, vehicles travelling in both directions do so at reduced speeds which should limit road safety issues. Powered	Comments noted
PO3876	Mrs Jane Bagguley				Object	Both these sites are good because they are well away from schools so as to help the traffic problems and the access and services are good. The land is not good agriculturally.	Comments noted
PO9591	Mrs P Bailey				Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN033: EN033/EN126 are located directly adjacent to medium flood risk area and Flood Zone 3. Land directly west has flooded in the past due to overtopping of a nearby culvert. Road has been unpassable during previous flood events. The loss	The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						of these Green Belt sites would result in loss of large area for rain water infiltration and storage. Along with new development hardstanding, surface water run off into culvert would increase. Surface water run off duration into culvert would reduce. Would increase risk of flood events. Construction and operational traffic associated with these sites would increase traffic levels in already congested area. Traffic lights hump bridge gets congested at peak times. Increased traffic would reduce quality of life. Given these flood risks, plans should be subject to particular scrutiny. Developers must ensure increase in drainage water will not exacerbate current road flooding issues. Request full scoping report + EIA (incorporating detailed FRA) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted.	has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site was limited <i>"Sites which form a reasonable extension to the south east of Endon, both of which are well contained on all sides. Whilst development would alter the setting of Endon along this entrance, the overall effect would not be significant, not affect the wider Green Belt in this location and be a clear limit to further development."</i> Recommended site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. - The Highway Authority advise the site is accessed via a private, unmade track leading to a Fine Feathers Farm, which is not suitable for two-way traffic. This would need third party land to widen it.
PO448	Mrs Patricia Bailey				Object	The proposed sites EN033 and EN126 are located directly adjacent to, and directly overlying along the south-west boundary, a 'medium' flood risk area and a 'Flood Zone 3' floodplain as designated by the Environment Agency. Experience living in the area has shown that the land directly to the west of the proposed sites has flooded a number of times in the last 30 years due to overtopping of the unnamed culvert to the west of	See response above

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Post Lane. Where the unnamed culvert passes beneath Post Lane in an enclosed section, the road has been rendered unpassable during previous flood events due to the height of rising flood waters when the flow capacity of the enclosed culvert has been exceeded. The loss of green belt land across the EN033 and EN126 sites would result in the loss of a large area of vegetated arable land with a high potential for rain water infiltration and storage. Combined with the construction of a significant area of new hardstanding, the volume of surface runoff water entering the culvert to the west of Post Lane is anticipated to greatly increase. Additionally, owing to the reduction in the current level of rain water storage and infiltration potential, the runoff duration of surface water entering the culvert would reduce. The cumulative effect of these these actions has the potential to significantly increase the likelihood, frequency and magnitude of flood events in the Post Lane area. The associated increase in short-term construction and long-term operation traffic related to the proposed EN033 and EN126 sites would increase traffic levels in an area which is already prone to high levels of traffic congestion. The canal crossing to the south east of the proposed sites is a traffic-light controlled single lane bridge which can become congested at peak times. Traffic flow and congestion around this area would surely increase with the construction a number of new dwellings reducing the quality of life for the existing residents, canal users and visitors. Taking into consideration the close proximity of the sites to a designated floodplain and the history of flooding over the roads in the Post Lane area, any plans to develop this area further should be subject to particular scrutiny. We consider it imperative that the proposed developers are questioned as to how they will ensure that the inevitable increase to the volume of drainage water directed to surface water drains will not exacerbate the current road flooding issues. In particular the proposed developers should address how the existing drainage bottleneck where the unnamed culvert passes below Post Lane shall not be exacerbated by the proposed development and associated increase in drainage water volume, whereby existing roads and properties will be put under increased risk of flooding. We would request that a full Environmental Scoping Report and Environmental Impact Assessment (incorporating a detailed flood risk assessment) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted to confirm the anticipated effects on flood risk and traffic levels are acceptable.	
PO4833					Object	This is Green Belt area subject to flooding. There would be poor dangerous access on Post Lane additional traffic from 24 new houses would make the lane more congested.	See response above

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2921	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Site EN033/EN126 will need to consider the Station Road/A53 junction.	Comments noted
PO749 PO716 PO668 PO706 PO744 PO710 PO740	MR Joseph Thomas Miss Beth Thomas MRS Melanie Thomas MR Ray Austin MR James Thomas MR Kevin Thomas MR David Thomas				Support	As the proposed density and housing capacity is very low and the development would be fairly well screened /unobtrusive from the highway I feel the impact would be minimal on the surrounding landscape. There has been little house building in this part of the village so I believe a small development would not be detrimental to the area. Vehicular access onto Post Lane would be at a point of the road which experiences low volumes of traffic and where vehicle speeds are reduced by the hump-backed bridge and traffic lights. therefore this should limit road safety issues. The site is in close proximity to Station Road and so would have easy access to local amenities.	Comments noted
PO4497	Miss Delphine Kemp Lovatt				Support	Dear Sir/Madam We are writing to confirm that the land in Endon Site EN 126 is readily available for development and we as the owners are supportive of it being used in the plan. We would like to highlight that the site is sustainable as it is close to schools, bus routes and the services of Endon. It is also within the village boundary.	Comments noted
PO759	Mrs Dilys Clarke				Support	The site is suitable for development and would easily accommodate the number of houses proposed. Access to the site is easily available. The development would have less impact on the local surroundings compared to other proposals.	Comments noted
PO318	Mr Robert G McCraight					This Green Belt brings the countryside to Endon. If you fill this with houses and concrete, the whole feeling of Endon being a village will disappear, as the canal will be like a barrier. Keep the building sites compact and don't spread them out like wings.	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site was limited <i>"Sites which form a reasonable extension to the south east of Endon, both of which are well contained on all sides. Whilst development would alter the setting of Endon along this entrance, the overall effect would not be significant, not affect the wider Green Belt in this location and be a clear limit to further development."</i> Recommended site could be considered

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							for release under exceptional circumstances. . In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies in the Local Plan to ensure character of the area is maintained.
PO745	Mr Trevor Clarke				Support	Ease of access and the site would readily take development.	Comments noted
PO905	MRS SUSAN WILSON				Object	Any development in Post Lane is an incursion into green belt land, on the Caldon Canal Conservation Area, will increase traffic onto a narrow lane, and is adjacent to the flood plain. I have lived in Post Lane for over 40 years and have benefited from the major flood relief work done in this area. This work would be severely compromised if current areas of arable land are built upon thus creating large areas of hard standing which in turn would increase the volume of surface run off water entering the nearby culvert. I have watched the level of water in that culvert and feel strongly that the bad old days of flooding will return. The traffic issue is also a major concern. The access/egress to this site is directly on to a narrow country lane and very close to a single lane bridge which would be in danger of damage from construction and increased traffic. Turning right out of the proposed entrance would lead traffic to a sharp left hand bend which has already been the scene of accidents. Traffic flow and the danger of further road traffic accidents and incidents would inevitably increase. These comments apply to sites EN033 and EN126	- See response to PO318 regarding Green Belt - The Highways Authority advises that sited on inside of a bend therefore appropriate visibility will be needed for any new junction and a footway provided. But otherwise, development is not ruled out. - Potential flood risk issues, recommend flood risk assessment and early engagement with County Council & Environment Agency
PO4834					Object	As above – but also above the canal is a conservation area. There are currently sufficient Brown Field site in both Leek add Stoke on Trent to accommodate all the required housing.	- Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies in the Local Plan regarding the Conservation Area - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy - National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the Districts housing requirement is met.
PO3877	Mrs Jane				Object	Both these sites are good because they are well away from	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Bagguley					schools so as to help the traffic problems and the access and services are good. The land is not good agriculturally.	
PO1067	Mr Stuart Davies				Object	Development of EN126 and EN033 will increase the amount of vehicles on Post Lane / Station Road and the dangerous junction with the A53, Leek Road. Better sites adjacent to the A53 should be considered before putting more traffic on side roads. The conservation area either side of Park Lane to the north of the A53 is a far better site for development and gives easy and safe access to the A53. Bus stops are also nearby.	- See response to PO905 regarding highways - See response to PO4834 regarding the Conservation Area
PO1948	Mr Frank Poole				Object	I am very concerned that any additional building in the Endon area will add to a flooding problem, which is already significant. The Staffordshire Moorlands Authority is already aware of this problem as detailed in your Level 1 SFRA report dated October 2015. Section 4.6.1 states : "18 records (of floods) between 1997 and 2012 are shown in Endon along Leek Road, of which 8 incidents occurred in 2012". I am aware of past flooding difficulties on the High View Estate, which can only be increased if the planned development takes place on sections EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101. I was present at a Parish Council meeting when the flooding on the High View were discussed with Staffordshire Moorlands representatives and to my knowledge these problems have not been resolved. The Endon Village has particular problems, being situated at the lowest point in the area, which is dissected by a brook, prone to overflowing its banks. In my view any development in Endon, without major investment to improve the main drains, will have an adverse affect on the Village. Inadequate drainage systems leads to flooding on Leek Road adjacent to Endon High School, this problem is increased because of significant water run off from the high ground at the Stoney Lane end of Brookfield Road. At times the volume of water is such that stones and other debris are swept along Brookfield, adding to poor drainage. I am concerned that additional building on section EN126 will significantly increase the current serious problems, because of additional dirty water entering the drains from new properties and surface water run off from an area, that currently acts as a soakaway. I also believe that additional water would be deposited on the Endon St Lukes School playing field, rendering it useless for a significant portion of the year. It is clear that the drainage system in Endon is inadequate and additional building will increase the current serious problems. In March 2014 Nick Boles , Minister for Local Planning, stated in Parliament - "We are issuing robust guidelines on flood risk, making it crystal clear that councils need to consider strict tests set out in national policy and where they are not met new developments should not be allowed." I trust that appropriate members and officials of the Local Authority will accept responsibility should their decisions have an adverse affect on properties in the area, and in particular my own property.	See response to PO905 regarding flooding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO9562	Mr Richard Bailey				Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN126: EN033/EN126 are located directly adjacent to medium flood risk area and Flood Zone 3. Land directly west has flooded in the past due to overtopping of a nearby culvert. Road has been unpassable during previous flood events. The loss of these Green Belt sites would result in loss of large area for rain water infiltration and storage. Along with new development hardstanding, surface water run off into culvert would increase. Surface water run off duration into culvert would reduce. Would increase risk of flood events. Construction and operational traffic associated with these sites would increase traffic levels in already congested area. Traffic lights hump bridge gets congested at peak times. Increased traffic would reduce quality of life. Given these flood risks, plans should be subject to particular scrutiny. Developers must ensure increase in drainage water will not exacerbate current road flooding issues. Request full scoping report + EIA (incorporating detailed FRA) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted.	- See response to PO905 regarding flooding & highways - See response to PO318 regarding Green Belt
PO450	Mrs Patricia Bailey				Object	The proposed sites EN033 and EN126 are located directly adjacent to, and directly overlying along the south-west boundary, a 'medium' flood risk area and a 'Flood Zone 3' floodplain as designated by the Environment Agency. Experience living in the area has shown that the land directly to the west of the proposed sites has flooded a number of times in the last 30 years due to overtopping of the unnamed culvert to the west of Post Lane. Where the unnamed culvert passes beneath Post Lane in an enclosed section, the road has been rendered unpassable during previous flood events due to the height of rising flood waters when the flow capacity of the enclosed culvert has been exceeded. The loss of green belt land across the EN033 and EN126 sites would result in the loss of a large area of vegetated arable land with a high potential for rain water infiltration and storage. Combined with the construction of a significant area of new hardstanding, the volume of surface runoff water entering the culvert to the west of Post Lane is anticipated to greatly increase. Additionally, owing to the reduction in the current level of rain water storage and infiltration potential, the runoff duration of surface water entering the culvert would reduce. The cumulative effect of these these actions has the potential to significantly increase the likelihood, frequency and magnitude of flood events in the Post Lane area. The associated increase in short-term construction and long-term operation traffic related to the proposed EN033 and EN126 sites would increase traffic levels in an area which is already prone to high levels of traffic congestion. The canal crossing to the south east of the proposed sites is a traffic-light controlled single lane bridge which can become congested at peak times. Traffic flow and congestion around this area would surely increase with the construction a number of new dwellings reducing the quality of life for the	See response to PO905 regarding flooding

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						existing residents, canal users and visitors. Taking into consideration the close proximity of the sites to a designated floodplain and the history of flooding over the roads in the Post Lane area, any plans to develop this area further should be subject to particular scrutiny. We consider it imperative that the proposed developers are questioned as to how they will ensure that the inevitable increase to the volume of drainage water directed to surface water drains will not exacerbate the current road flooding issues. In particular the proposed developers should address how the existing drainage bottleneck where the unnamed culvert passes below Post Lane shall not be exacerbated by the proposed development and associated increase in drainage water volume, whereby existing roads and properties will be put under increased risk of flooding. We would request that a full Environmental Scoping Report and Environmental Impact Assessment (incorporating a detailed flood risk assessment) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted to confirm the anticipated effects on flood risk and traffic levels are acceptable.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO4836					EN128	General comment	Undecided.	• Comment noted
PO4469	Mr and Mrs F.A Downing				EN128	Object	As we were away when the meeting took place, we feel we must voice our objections, even at this late stage. Since living in Post Lane for 39 years the bulk of the traffic and speed at what it has increased tremendously, putting extreme stress on the old canal bridge in this old part of the Endon village. Putting up extra homes in the immediate vicinity will exacerbate the situation with a daily exit of cars and people using the country lane with little or no pavements now used as a short cut by HGV's! Surely these are accidents waiting to happen! Owing to the fact that the dwellings are to build on the low lying fields that are often flooded, is not a good idea. We would like you to consider the implications of this site and choose an alternative one as we deem this to be unsuitable.	• The Highways Authority advises that the site is developable subject to adequate visibility although will require access improvements/ third party land; or demolition of property if via Brookfield Avenue (and has not ruled out the latter as an option). • The Environment Agency did not raise any site specific issues. Staffordshire County Council as LLFA identified potential flood risk issues, recommend flood risk assessment and early engagement with County Council
PO3871	Mr G B Chatfield				EN128	Object	More properly on this lane would only increase traffic in in Brookfield Avenue which even now gets blocked at school times. The extra traffic would endanger school children. The proposed development, to gain access to Brookfield Avenue would not give sufficient room for the road that would give good site at Brookhouse Junction.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO3872	Ms Pauline Daniels				EN128	Object	More houses in a very small area will cause further congestion on Brookfield Avenue as the Avenue is not very wide and already suffers from congestion at peak times when children attending St Lukes primary and Endon High School are dropped off. It is already difficult to get out onto the A53 without road fitting into Brookfield Avenue bringing congestion. Traffic convergences from other homes in Hazlewood Road, Cedar Avenue, Stoney Lane, Woodstone Avenue and Bassnetts Wood and so at peak times it is very busy and difficult to get onto the A53 building and construction traffic will add further problems. Cars have to park on the pavement to enable the traffic to get down the road – please see photographs attached – taken on a quiet day. More houses mean extra school places and demands on Drs Surgeries.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
								additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO3874	Mr and Mrs S Tinsley				EN128	Object	Access to Dollisfield no double access at the present time. Question what options for access available if properties were built how would this affect the water flow of the stream, at the moment this is unhindered, concerns over damage to the stream during building and impact on surrounding properties size of suggested 20 properties and if access suitability of the area behind a school and if access from Brookfield which falls between two schools. Concerns rose over extra properties and number of extra residents and children. School places plus health services in surrounding area. Amount of increased road traffic on Brookfield Avenue is dangerous for children for the two schools. Extra traffic from Brookfield at busy times onto main Leek Road Endon.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure
PO1418	Mr P Deaville				EN128	Object	Brookfield Ave being situated between 2 schools already has it problems with cars (parking to pick up children) the building of more houses on this site will mean more vehicles have to access the site and will cause more congestion at the junction of Brookfield Ave and A53	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO3875	Mr and Mrs S Tinsley				EN128	Object	The access to this site wherever it is will make a big impact on this very busy Avenue at school times access from the A53 is often blocked making it impossible for emergency vehicles and dangerous for the children, more houses and building will make a bad problem worse and endanger life.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO254	Mr and Mrs A.J. Eardley				EN128	Object	Brookfield Avenue was originally designed as a minor residential road. It now caters for the traffic delivering to and from a High School, a Primary School and houses along Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Woodside Avenue and Basnetts Wood. To further increase this traffic by cars/lorries/emergency vehicles etc for a further 20 houses would overload the infrastructure and compromise the safety of pupils walking to and from school and traffic emerging from the junction at Leek Road. Our primary concerns are as follows: The proximity of the proposed access road via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue to our driveway (No 12) would be less than 2.5 metres (assuming a footpath of 2m alongside the proposed access road). We do not have space to turn cars around in our driveway so would therefore need to either reverse in or out across the face of the proposed access road junction. Any increase in volume of traffic using Brookfield Avenue would make it unsafe for children to play outside. Local children currently cycle, skateboard and play ball in the road outside our house and this would be unthinkable with another junction within Brookfield Avenue. Primary and High School children have to cross Brookfield Avenue twice a day in order to get to school and the junction with Leek Road, at which they cross, would become even more hazardous. Traffic noise and pollution levels would be raised from vehicles waiting to exit the junction from Brookfield Avenue onto Leek Road. This would	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application • Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the area is maintained. The • Whilst the site is currently identified as Visual Open Space, the site was not identified for retention as such in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. The Council is not obliged to retain this designation. Therefore the site was included as a potential housing option. • New housing schemes depending on their size will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							further increase associated health problems for people living in the vicinity and at both the Primary and High schools. Brookfield Avenue is used as a pick up and drop off point for children using the two schools. Vehicles travel to the top of the road and turn at the end before dropping their children off. There is no through route for this so every vehicle travels up and down the road and a queue already develops at the junction to the main road, compromising safety of pedestrians and vehicles attempting to enter Brookfield Avenue from the main road. Traffic queues back onto the main road even though double yellow lines have been painted at the junction (cars still park on them). The extended traffic queues and the additional junction within Brookfield Avenue would compromise access to driveways. Specifically relating to the proposed access road as a result of demolishing No 14 Brookfield Avenue our concerns are as follows: There would be an unacceptable level of noise and pollution from traffic using the proposed access road directly alongside our property, which is built right up to the boundary between No 12 and No 14 Brookfield Avenue. There would be an unacceptable level of light pollution from traffic using the proposed access road and any necessary street lighting required for public safety in such close proximity to our property. The demolition of No.14 and the construction of the proposed access road would cause disturbance to our property, which is built right up to the boundary. Construction traffic in the process of building 20 new houses would create an unacceptable level of noise, dust and inconvenience. The space available between the boundaries of No 12 and No 16 would not provide sufficient width for an access road with the required visibility splay at the junction with Brookfield Avenue. Environmental issues regarding any building on Dollisfield (EN128) would severely impact on the current properties in the surrounding area. Flooding of Leek Road (and the houses alongside) in the vicinity of site EN128 is a recurrent issue due to rainfall runoff from the adjacent hillside. Any building on Dollisfield would exacerbate this, since the field currently serves as a natural soak-away. Previous flooding has resulted in failure of street lighting in Brookfield Avenue. The current drainage system is clearly insufficient and would only be further compromised by greater surface water due to increased development and lack of soak-away. Rivers have been seen and filmed coming down Brookfield Avenue within recent years with resultant damage to property. St Luke's Primary School playing fields are currently inaccessible to children until Easter each year due to the soggy nature of the field. Any development in Dollisfield would make this much worse. The Government's own planning policy demands new developments take into account the health and well being of residents. Children need their playing fields. EN128 has been designated Visual Open Space. This is essential to maintain the semi-rural feel of Endon and the	as the consideration of new links in line with Local Plan policy. • The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site had fairly low biodiversity value <i>"The site has fairly low biodiversity value overall and the site is set within a mainly urban environment with poor connectivity to the wider countryside."</i> • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							health of people living here. The wildlife living within and around the field provides the soundtrack appropriate to a semi-rural neighbourhood and this would be obliterated by the proposed development.	
PO105	Mr James Shaw				EN128	Object	Building 20 extra houses just off Brookfield Avenue will make an already busy junction with the A53 (Leek Road) even busier as well as building on valuable green space.	See response to PO4469 regarding traffic and PO254 regarding open space
PO175	Mrs Heather Djuranovic				EN128	Object	I attended the consultation session at Endon Village Hall and took the opportunity to talk to representatives of the Council about the proposed site EN128. It was explained to me that it would be highly unlikely that the council would support knocking down a semi detached house to create access for the site. It was suggested that Stony Lane would need to become an adopted road. I posed the question about the fact that it is a narrow lane; how would it work? This is what I understood to true: Once an adopted road Stony lane would have to become a 'one way street' If Developers can't get the road adopted the site would not be considered If the road is adopted and developers still wish to create another entrance to the site they can apply for permission to demolish the semi (owned by the land owner) My opposition for the consideration of EN128 is this: Traffic congestion in the vicinity of the proposed site, particularly at school opening and closing times, is a major problem, causing hold-ups and backlogs for up to 2 miles, and causing difficulty for joining traffic from side-roads, i.e. Platts Avenue, Kent Drive, Spencer Avenue, Greenmeadow Grove. Increased traffic flow on Brookfield Avenue, Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Basnetts Wood and the parking of vehicles in these areas for up to 1 hour around school closing times, causes a traffic hazard due to the difficulty in gaining access and egress for other road users, residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc. Parking restrictions introduced in the last two years are largely ignored. Once adopted Stoney Lane would become a Rat Run for School traffic, with cars travelling in a loop around the proposed site. Residents of Brookfield Avenue already find it difficult to negotiate this traffic without the addition of even more residents that a new development presents. Brookfield Avenue is flanked on both sides by un-adopted roads (Basnetts Wood & Stoney Lane) which make the Brookfield Avenue turning a very busy one; even without School time traffic. Above all, the increase in traffic would be of greater danger to pedestrians walking to and from the schools either side of Brookfield Avenue. All of the CURRENT issues described within this comment can be evidenced with videos that clearly show the impact of heavy traffic.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO1075	Ms Carol Burton				EN128	Object	I strongly oppose the proposed development of this site en128 as a preferred option ' The site is wholly inappropriate: a concentration of houses in this area would result in increased problems with traffic , overloaded service infrastructure, damage	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							to the environment, negative impact to the wellbeing of local residents. I put forward the following points to substantiate my objection. Additional housing in this site would generate more traffic using the Brookfield Avenue approach already carries a large amount of traffic. In addition to its own houses it provides access to Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Avenue and its adjoining cul-de-sacs. The volume of traffic is added to at school times when car parking still causes congestion and considerable inconvenience to local residents. Parking restrictions are in place at school times but they are regularly ignored. Not only do drivers park on single yellow lines at the junction of Brookfield Avenue and the A53 Leek Road. The latter practice is hazardous as drivers turning into the avenue may still be faced with an unexpected obstruction. Pedestrians too, many of them school children, are particularly at risk at these times. The congestion from parked cars often causes passing vehicles to be driven on the pavement while it is being used by pedestrians. This is highly dangerous and illegal manoeuvre. Additional traffic from a further concentration of housing would undoubtedly add to the existing problems and dangers of an already overcrowded avenue may undoubtedly add to the existing problems and dangers of an already overcrowded avenue. Vehicle frequently use the junctions of Brookfield Avenue/A53 and Brookfield Avenue/Stoney Lane for turning. This is not limited to light vehicles but also trucks (not involved in deliveries in the Avenue) and more recently, a number of buses have been seen using the Avenue as a turning facility. If the access from Brookfield Avenue to a new development was to be as suggested on the original Site Assessment Form it would offer a 3rd turning area and in doing so, create another potentially dangerous. Brookfield Avenue is an attractive avenue – not just a subjective view but one frequently expressed by people from outside the area, including international visitors. The suggestion of using no 14, half a semidetached house as a possible access point as shown on the original plan in 2015, would ruin the whole character and aspect of the avenue for existing residents. In any case it doubtful whether the space occupied by this property is of sufficient width to provide a fully operational roadway and pavements within legal requirements. Furthermore, it appears perverse that the proposed demolition of a existing house would contribute to solving the housing shortage. The proposed site borders a Primary School with a playing field which would be overlooked by the proposed houses. Children engage in sports activities and play near the boundary. Development of this site would be of serious concerns about safeguarding of young pupils. Several Water courses exist in the vicinity. At times of heavy rain the drains struggle/fail to cope with that so that rainwater would significantly flowing down Brookfield Avenue leads to a build-up of water on the A53. Further strain and	• See response to PO254 regarding village character and residential amenity • The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. • Resident's views have been sought as part of the consultation. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							pressure on the drainage infrastructure from additional housing would significantly increase the problem. The SMDC has gone to great lengths to involve residents across the district to engage in the consultation procedures. To discover that the site EN128 has emerged as a preferred option despite our local village council's representation on our behalf as well as many known objections submitted by residents makes one wonder whether the whole 'consultation process has simply been a cosmetic exercise to placate residents and give an impression of democratic involvement. A preferred option – preferred by whom? Other more suitable sites exist. The Endon Parish Council has I understand already objected to the development of this site. It has also formulated an alternative, more acceptable and more workable plan which would have resolve many of the problems which would be caused by the original plan put forward by SMDC. I strongly propose that SMDC should listen and take note of the views that this plan should be the 1 to follow for the benefit of all the Endon Residents who are affected. By this development issue.	
PO693	MRS Melanie Thomas				EN128	Object	I wish to object to this site on the following grounds: Infrastructure – schools Infrastructure – traffic Flood risk Amenity – noise/light pollution, loss of wildlife Scale of development Government Policy The site is designated as Visual Open Space to protect the semi rural feel of the village and offer a break in development. Due to significant house building in Endon over the last 20 years, which has seen infill development erode the majority of natural breaks between properties, it is now more vital than ever to protect remaining open spaces within the centre of the village. Although the site was not identified for retention as Visual Open Space in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment, Core Strategy directs that existing open spaces should be retained. 20 years ago planning applications for this site were rejected by the local Parish Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, who both fully supported the community's view that this VOS was significantly important to Endon village. When the applicant appealed the decision to refuse planning consent, the Planning Inspector upheld the District council's decision, acknowledging the value of the open site as a community asset. Nothing has changed since to justify the destruction of this designation and it is even more vital to protect the few remaining open spaces to preserve the 'village' identity. The Parish council have recently reaffirmed their support to maintain the VOS on this site by voting, as part of this consultation exercise, to reject EN128 as suitable for development. The existing gateway to the site is on Stoney Lane, an unadopted, extremely narrow lane (and Bridleway) which is highly unsuitable to accommodate increased traffic volumes. The proposed alternative access via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue would require demolition of one semi	• See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, design, residential amenity and open space • See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations • The previous planning application refusal was under the existing planning policy at the time the consultation is on proposals to update planning policy and provide a new Local Plan • See response to PO254 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							detached property, which would adversely impact on the adjoining property (No, 16) and spoil the aesthetic appearance of the Avenue. One half of a pair of semi-detached houses left standing would look ridiculous and not in keeping with other remaining properties. It is highly doubtful that the space created by knocking down No.14 would provide an access road sufficiently wide enough for 2 passing vehicles and a pavement, in which case No.16 would also require demolition. To demolish well maintained, mature properties in order to build new homes is perverse and would undermine the site's capacity deliver the projected number of new homes. To create a mini estate off Brookfield Avenue would exacerbate the existing traffic problems, caused by pupils being dropped off and picked up from Endon High and St Luke's Primary schools. The Avenue is already blighted by heavy parking, congestion at both ends of the school day and dangerous manoeuvres by inconsiderate drivers, despite the installation of double yellow and single yellow line parking restrictions. 27 proposed properties on this site could realistically generate an additional 40-50 vehicles (plus visitors) per day using the bottom section of Brookfield Avenue, and at its busiest point - where it joins the A53. This would create more traffic chaos and further reduce the safety of schoolchildren and residents, as school parking would extend into the new cul-de-sac and drivers would use the access road as an additional turning point. EN128 is problematic as a potential site due to its proximity to a water course. To gain access from Brookfield Avenue it would be necessary to build a road/bridge over the existing brook. In recent years during heavy rainfall, the level of the brook has been extremely high. Additionally, following construction of a new house at the top of Brookfield Avenue, there have been flooding problems down the full length of the road. Any further development would only serve to seriously increase the risk of flooding. I strongly disagree with the Site Assessment Form's statement that 'a high density here would be in keeping with surroundings'. It is difficult to comprehend how a Density of 38.03 could possibly be justified. Taking account of the natural brook, which runs between the site and rear gardens on Brookfield Avenue, any new properties would need to be built some distance from the water course – which would reduce the available space. Considering also the need for access roads to each area of the site, it would seem highly unlikely that the site could accommodate anywhere near 27 properties, even if they were small 'affordable' starter homes. This reduces the viability of using this site to help deliver the required number of houses in the village. On one boundary of the site is an open school playing field, with a large detached property/gardens forming the second. Detached/semi-detached properties on good sized plots in Brookfield Avenue form the third boundary, with the characterful Stoney Lane forming the	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							fourth boundary. This comprises mature, predominantly large properties situated on very generous plots and the road is one of the oldest in the village, being an unadopted lane and bridleway. Therefore a high density housing development would be completely out of keeping in this location and would spoil the aesthetic appearance of the area. How can a site which has been recognised for many years as a valuable Visual Open Space and an amenity for the village now be deemed suitable for a high density housing development? Any construction on this site will cause significant loss of amenity to local residents; from loss of views/outlook onto an open meadow, to resulting light pollution and noise pollution. It would adversely impact on the habitats of the natural wildlife, particularly birds which thrive here, and destroy the peace and tranquillity which has benefitted generations of local residents. Those living in properties on Brookfield Avenue and Stoney Lane would see the quietness of this location destroyed. Even with the windows closed you can hear a constant and wonderful variety of birdsong, which creates a real sense of rural life and serves to enhance the local area for everyone. The loss of this open space, which was a major consideration when most of the residents moved here, would be immense and would also result in a significant reduction in the value of nearby properties. To infill this site would also have a detrimental impact on the open aspect of St Luke's school playing field. The semi-rural feel of the children's outdoor space would disappear and the view and noise arising from development would negatively impact on the quality of school life. Since the school was built generations of children have enjoyed the benefits of this meadow which borders their playing field. To develop in this location would not only ruin the semi rural feel of the school, and change its environment by completely enclosing it, but would also be failing to plan for the longer term future of the village and its need for recreational space. The proposed number of new houses to be built in Endon (Stanley & Brown Edge) will put further pressure on local schools, which the District Council already accepts are oversubscribed. St Luke's has already extended its buildings onto the adjoining playing field and removed the 'wildlife area' to compensate. With increased demand from more pupils there is a real risk that it would need to extend further onto its recreational field, reducing the openness even more. Rather than seek to destroy this open space for housing, I strongly believe it makes more sense to protect the Visual Open Space and retain the future option of utilising it as a recreational playing field for the schools/children in the community. Access could be gained off the A53 via St Luke's school. This would provide a much better use of the site and serve the longer term needs of the village and its school children. I believe that the District Council should listen more to the views of Endon with Stanley Parish	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Council and local residents, as they will have to live with the consequences of any development in our village. Rather than build high numbers of properties in 4 locations I believe it is preferable to build a few homes situated around the village, to limit the impact of any development. I propose the following alternative sites as more suitable for development than EN128: EN030 - I support the construction of 4 dwellings, at the bottom of this site/close to the lane, as long as they are of a traditional design and in keeping with the immediate surroundings. If this was delivered in a similar way to the dwellings built on the site of the former smithy, there would be minimal impact on the old village. EN024 - I support some development on this site as density/capacity is extremely low and dwellings would be well screened from the A53 by trees, therefore impact on landscape would be minimal. Access already exists via Greenmeadow Grove and any increased traffic volumes would be small. Very few number of vehicles access the A53 from this point, so congestion would not be an issue. EN137 - I support a small number of properties on this site, as it is well screened from most sides. Even after development there would remain a significant area of open space in this location, which would help to minimise the impact.	
PO275	Mrs Carol Burton				EN128	Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: There is a huge groundswell of opinion against this proposal. The number of objections outweighs the number of councillors who voted for this 'option' The site is within a few metres of a water course. The building of many more dwellings and attendant problems of substantial road and sewerage development would be unsustainable [photos attached to letter]. The plan shows access through one semi detached house on Brookfield Avenue, breaking it in two and causing disruption to already heavy traffic in the process. There is no room for an exit road through the centre of the avenue. Another alleged route is .. the junction of Stoney Lane. There is a high volume of traffic already on the avenue at school times. Children are already at considerable risk of traffic. Dollisfield has long been designated 'visual open space' and as such is essential to the well being of local residents who have to endure heavy traffic. Dollisfield borders the school playing field. St Luke's Primary School's quiet area is adjacent to this field. The VOS contributes to pupils' well being. More housing would mean that the school would be hemmed in. Dollisfield supports a wide variety of plant and animal life (includes oak TPO). Local residents and pupils get pleasure from observing wildlife. To build on this land would be to upset the eco-balance of the area. Queries different descriptions on site assessment form as being contradictory. Please restore faith in SMDC and represent the people who elected you. Use Endon Parish Council as the model to achieve the best for your constituents. Endon Parish Council	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding village character, wildlife, open space and residential amenity • The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. • The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							has not shied away from finding APPROPRIATE sites and coming up with a very viable alternative plan.	
PO148	Mr Malcolm Dale				EN128	Object	Reasons for response Please identify the issues relevant to your response. Infrastructure - schools Infrastructure - traffic/transport Infrastructure - other Landscape Nature conservation Flood risk Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) Scale of development Other Do you have any comments? Impact on traffic volume and flow/Health and Safety A traffic survey undertaken approximately 2 years ago found that 17,000 vehicles a day pass through Endon on the A53. A letter dated 6th January 1984 (in our possession) from the Dept of Environment and Transport re proposed buildings on this site at that time (1983), in answer to an appeal by the executors of Harry Taylor (dec'd) states ".....the effect of your client's proposal upon the traffic flow along Brookfield Avenue. In my judgment the balance of argument is overwhelmingly that this appeal must fail". This is even more relevant now with the increased volume of traffic. Traffic congestion in the vicinity of the proposed site, particularly at school opening and closing times, is a major problem, causing hold-ups and backlogs for up to 2 miles, and causing difficulty for joining traffic from side-roads, i.e. Platts Avenue, Kent Drive, Spencer Avenue, Greenmeadow Grove. The junction of Station Road and Clay Lake with the A53 is already a difficult junction to negotiate with limited visibility. Increased traffic flow on Brookfield Avenue, Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Basnetts Wood and the parking of vehicles in these areas for up to 1 hour around school closing times, causes a traffic hazard due to the difficulty in gaining access and egress for other road users, residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc. Parking restrictions introduced in the last two years are largely ignored and have only resulted in stationary traffic moving from Brookfield Avenue to Cedar Crescent and Hazelwood Road. This is a hazard to the increasingly elderly population in this vicinity. The current volume of traffic as detailed above is also a danger to school children, pedestrians and all other road users. When driving in these areas avoiding action is often needed to prevent accidents/collisions. Access . Proposed access to the site is from Brookfield Avenue. This alone would not provide a wide enough access to the site. The entry radii need to be sufficient to accommodate the swept path of all vehicles and would add further to the congestion. Access to and from the site via Brookfield Avenue could not support the potential increase of up to 54 residents' vehicles and additional related traffic throughout the day and particularly at school times and peak time traffic. Stoney Lane is an unadopted road and is not wide enough to provided suitable access to the site. Impact on schools. Increased demand on already over-subscribed schools in the area due to a potential increase in the size of the school population. Flooding . Heavy rain in recent years (notably 2013) caused flash flooding	• See response to PO4469 regarding flooding and highways • See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, residential amenity, village character and open space • See response PO 3872 regarding infrastructure • Loss of property values are not a material planning consideration • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							throughout the village, particularly in Stoney lane and Brookfield Avenue to a depth of at least 18 inches, and extending on to the A53 and further afield, causing damage to some properties and severely restricting access. Designated Visual Open Space. The site has been designated a Visual Open Space for at least 20+ years. Regardless of what any owner of the space may do to restrict the visual impact, e.g. planting trees/hedges, the site remains a visual open space. This site occupies a visually prominent position and contributes to the spaciousness of this area. Any building on this site would harm the openness, character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not add visual value to the area. To build on this site would urbanise the area even further and impact detrimentally on the village character. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states that pursuing sustainable development also involves seeking positive improvements to the quality of the built and natural environment. I consider that site EN128 should retain its current 'Designated Visual Open Space' status which has been in operation for at least 30 years. The loss of this open space would be visually, aesthetically and environmentally detrimental to the surrounding built-up residential area. Property values. Low cost housing would not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding properties and could have a detrimental effect on their value, with the subsequent negative impact on residents. Preferred Development Areas/Sites Before any Greenbelt land is reclassified in Endon village all Brownfield sites should be fully exhausted. In addition any proposed site should be considered which would have minimal impact to existing residents. One site, EN130, and the site opposite to EN130 between the Black Horse and lay-by (on the left while heading towards Longsdon) which I understand was removed from later versions; should be considered first. These would provide direct access onto the A53 without having a negative effect on existing junctions, would allow infrastructure to connect easily and would reduce the risk of flooding. It would also not impact any Green Belt vistas. I consider that this area could be sufficient to accommodate all the building requirements in Endon for the specified period.	
PO1477	Mr Neville Mayer				EN128	Object	Residents in bassnets wood road, hazelwood road, woodstone ave. Cedars cress and stoney lane have no reasonable access to the a53 except via Brookfield ave. The ave (along with parts of Stoney lane/hazelwood road already caters for vehicle taking twice a day for children attending St Lukes & the high street such parking also involves drivers making 360degree turns in the mouth of Brookfield avenue with the A%3 likewise on the right angle bend of brookfield ave with stoney lane. All this dangerous traffic movement are a conflict with pedestrians (particularly children) arriving on foot to attend the local 2 schools in addition the 2 pedestrian crossings, wardens for the schools generate traffic hold ups In both directions on the A53 itself, thereby	See response to PO4469 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							interfering with the flow of the traffic entering and exiting Brookfield venue. The added mix of pedestrian's movement generated by the erection of 27 dwellings on site EN128 surely makes this a non-starter Not with standing all of the above, if the site was to be developed I consider that planning permission should be granted on the basis of a section 107 agreement whereby bassnetts wood road was 'made up' the developer for its total length to the highway auth requirements. This would trouble the much needs additional access point onto the a53 work that's long overdue!	
PO9541	Miss Christine Daniels				EN128	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: more houses means more cars, more congestion, inconvenience to current residents. Narrow road. Additional strain on schools, doctors surgeries etc Brookfield Ave is narrow, which joins the extremely busy A53. Already traffic from nearby housing estate roads which converge on Brookfield Ave before joining A53. Extremely congested particularly at school times. if access is to be halfway along Brookfield Ave subsequent traffic would double bottleneck and enhance hazards to pedestrians/schoolchildren/drivers. refer to attached photos that demonstrate congestion.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure
PO9542	Mr and Mrs J. Durber				EN128	Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: totally reject site for building land. Have been involved since 1995 in fighting to keep EN128 as field of local importance and from an amenity, noise and privacy point of view. In last Structure Plan SMDC with Parish Council and residents, won over the field to be retained as Visual Open Space. The [Government] Inspector recommended that the land be retained as VOS and that the land provided an important contribution to the open and semi-rural character of the neighbourhood and should be retained on amenity grounds. He also stated that there were no grounds for allocating additional land for housing in this location. We believe this is still the case. Question what has changed to this VOS in last 20 years Owner has removed this VOS for all concerned. Has grown dense hedges around boundaries of site, and removed oak trees. VOS has gradually been eroded against everything Inspector stated. site is landlocked unless houses demolished (unlikely), or if redevelopment of Stoney Lane. Stormwater drainage to site (also 3 streams in vicinity). Occasional flooding causing major problems. extra water to stormwater drainage will make drainage system worse, to ultimate outfall. safety concerns for schoolchildren and parents (Endon High and St Lukes schools). Car parking on nearby roads and pavements, double parking etc. A53 congested particularly at school times. Recent car smashes. schools presently over-committed. transport infrastructure not sufficient, need updating/renewing. Sewers and underground electric services need renewing. flooding a major problem in Endon low lying areas, caused by over development and lack of	• See response to PO254 regarding residential amenity, design open space and village character • See response to PO4469 regarding flooding • See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							work to local watercourses. question whether Endon sewage works capable of taking additional sewage/water; whether would cause flooding. conservation - greenfields, woodlands etc being eroded for housebuilding. Question if there are "brownfield areas" that could be used first. local people's views ignored, or misled. QUESTION WHY WE NEED ALL THESE HOUSES - Council need to give justified reasons (other than raising £1000/year per new homes bonus). Thousands of properties for sale or empty. Council's proposals for Endon should be scrapped. Instead Council should adopt Endon Parish Council proposals (Hewitt & Carr).	
PO3887	Mrs Angela Jones				EN128	Object	School traffic still a terrible problem in Brookfield Avenue with drivers still waiting Brookfield Avenue even with yellow lines and restricted parking hours put into place with no-one policing this. Drivers are still stopping of and picking up children here, especially on the corner of the avenue leaving vehicle's mainly residents vehicles trying to access their properties queuing on the main road. The problem traffic has been pushed into Hazelwood Road leaving residents here sometimes having the same problems. Putting more houses and therefore more vehicles into an already nightmare is just an accident waiting to happen here.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO708 PO704 PO741 PO755 PO733 PO738	MR Kevin Thomas MR Ray Austin MR James Thomas MR Joseph Thomas Miss Beth Thomas MR David Thomas				EN128	Object	The site is designated as Visual Open Space to protect the semi rural feel of the village and offer a break in development. Due to significant house building in Endon over the last 20 years, which has seen infill development erode the majority of natural breaks between properties, it is now more vital than ever to protect remaining open spaces within the centre of the village. Although the site was not identified for retention as Visual Open Space in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment, Core Strategy directs that existing open spaces should be retained. 20 years ago planning applications for this site were rejected by the local Parish Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, who both fully supported the community's view that this VOS was significantly important to Endon village. When the applicant appealed the decision to refuse planning consent, the Planning Inspector upheld the District council's decision, acknowledging the value of the open site as a community asset. Nothing has changed since to justify the destruction of this designation and it is even more vital to protect the few remaining open spaces to preserve the 'village' identity. The Parish council have recently reaffirmed their support to maintain the VOS on this site by voting, as part of this consultation exercise, to reject EN128 as suitable for development. The existing gateway to the site is on Stoney Lane, an unadopted, extremely narrow lane (and Bridleway) which is highly unsuitable to accommodate increased traffic volumes. The proposed alternative access via No.14 Brookfield Avenue would require demolition of one semi-detached property, which	- See response to PO3872 - See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, design, village character, open space - See response to PO693 regarding previous planning refusal - See response to PO1075 & PO275 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations - See response to PO254 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							would adversely impact on the adjoining property (No. 16) and spoil the aesthetic appearance of the Avenue. One half of a pair of semi-detached houses left standing would look ridiculous and not in keeping with other remaining properties. It is highly doubtful that the space created by knocking down No.14 would provide an access road sufficiently wide enough for 2 passing vehicles and a pavement, in which case No.16 would also require demolition. To demolish well maintained, mature properties in order to build new homes is perverse and would undermine the site's capacity deliver the projected number of new homes. To create a mini estate off Brookfield Avenue would exacerbate the existing traffic problems, caused by pupils being dropped off and picked up from Endon High and St Luke's Primary schools. The Avenue is already blighted by heavy parking, congestion at both ends of the school day and dangerous manoeuvres by inconsiderate drivers, despite the installation of double yellow and single yellow line parking restrictions. 27 proposed properties on this site could realistically generate an additional 40-50 vehicles (plus visitors) per day using the bottom section of Brookfield Avenue, and at its busiest point - where it joins the A53. This would create more traffic chaos and further reduce the safety of schoolchildren and residents, as school parking would extend into the new cul-de-sac and drivers would use the access road as an additional turning point. EN128 is problematic as a potential site due to its proximity to a water course. To gain access from Brookfield Avenue it would be necessary to build a road/bridge over the existing brook. In recent years during heavy rainfall, the level of the brook has been extremely high. Additionally, following construction of a new house at the top of Brookfield Avenue, there have been flooding problems down the full length of the road. Any further development would only serve to seriously increase the risk of flooding. I strongly disagree with the Site Assessment Form's statement that 'a high density here would be in keeping with surroundings'. It is difficult to comprehend how a Density of 38.03 could possibly be justified. Taking account of the natural brook, which runs between the site and rear gardens on Brookfield Avenue, any new properties would need to be built some distance from the water course – which would reduce the available space. Considering also the need for access roads to each area of the site, it would seem highly unlikely that the site could accommodate anywhere near 27 properties, even if they were small 'affordable' starter homes. This reduces the viability of using this site to help deliver the required number of houses in the village. On one boundary of the site is an open school playing field, with a large detached property/gardens forming the second. Detached/semi-detached properties on good sized plots in Brookfield Avenue form the third boundary, with the characterful Stoney Lane forming the fourth boundary. This	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							comprises mature, predominantly large properties situated on very generous plots and the road is one of the oldest in the village, being an unadopted lane and bridleway. Therefore a high density housing development would be completely out of keeping in this location and would spoil the aesthetic appearance of the area. How can a site which has been recognised for many years as a valuable Visual Open Space, and an amenity for the village, now be deemed suitable for a high density housing development? Any construction on this site will cause significant loss of amenity to local residents; from loss of views/outlook onto an open meadow, to resulting light pollution and noise pollution. It would adversely impact on the habitats of the natural wildlife, particularly birds which thrive here, and destroy the peace and tranquillity which has benefitted generations of local residents. Those living in properties on Brookfield Avenue and Stoney Lane would see the quietness of this location destroyed. Even with the windows closed you can hear a constant and wonderful variety of birdsong, which creates a real sense of rural life and serves to enhance the local area for everyone. The loss of this open space, which was a major consideration when most of the residents moved here, would be immense and would also result in a significant reduction in the value of nearby properties. To infill this site would also have a detrimental impact on the open aspect of St Luke's school playing field. The semi-rural feel of the children's outdoor space would disappear and the view and noise arising from development would negatively impact on the quality of school life. Since the school was built generations of children have enjoyed the benefits of this meadow which borders their playing field. To develop in this location would not only ruin the semi rural feel of the school, and change its environment by completely enclosing it, but would also be failing to plan for the longer term future of the village and its need for recreational space. The proposed number of new houses to be built in Endon (Stanley & Brown Edge) will put further pressure on local schools, which the District Council already accepts are oversubscribed. St Luke's has already extended its buildings onto the adjoining playing field and removed the 'wildlife area' to compensate. With increased demand from more pupils there is a real risk that it would need to extend further onto its recreational field, reducing the openness even more. Rather than seek to destroy this open space for housing, I strongly believe it makes more sense to protect the Visual Open Space and retain the future option of utilising it as a recreational playing field for the schools/children in the community. Access could be gained off the A53 via St Luke's school. This would provide a much better use of the site and serve the longer term needs of the village and its school children. I believe that the District Council should listen more to the views of Endon with Stanley Parish	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Council and local residents, as they will have to live with the consequences of any development in our village. Rather than build high numbers of properties in 4 locations I believe it is preferable to build a few homes situated around the village, to limit the impact of any development. I propose the following alternative sites as more suitable for development than EN128: EN030 - I support the construction of 4 dwellings, at the bottom of this site/close to the lane, as long as they are of a traditional design and in keeping with the immediate surroundings. If this was delivered in a similar way to the dwellings built on the site of the former smithy, there would be minimal impact on the old village. EN024 - I support some development on this site as density/capacity is extremely low and dwellings would be well screened from the A53 by trees, therefore impact on landscape would be minimal. Access already exists via Greenmeadow Grove and any increased traffic volumes would be small. Very few number of vehicles access the A53 from this point, so congestion would not be an issue. EN137 - I support a small number of properties on this site, as it is well screened from most sides. Even after development there would remain a significant area of open space in this location, which would help to minimise the impact.	
PO1419	Mr D Barker				EN128	Object	This development is likely to cause massive disruption to Brookfield both during the building stage and the additional 30/40 vehicles which will result from a further 20 residences using out already overbooked road on a daily basis. As you are well aware Brookfield avenue has already had several problems with the traffic for several years and due to its proximity of two of the schools this is exacerbation would catastrophic. I am sure there are several much better site in Endon which will not cause problems for the residents	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO147	mr neil baddeley				EN128	Object	this development would add to the problems of access in Brookfield Avenue during school drop offs and pick ups. There is already severe congestion with people parking their cars, sometimes on double yellow lines at peak times	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO750	Mr Trevor Clarke				EN128	Object	This was originally an area designated as visual open space and was changed with little consultation. There are far too many properties proposed for the size of the plot. Access is proposed by knocking down an existing property(a semi-detached), the resulting space created would be too narrow to accommodate the resulting residential and service traffic. There would be a significant increase in general traffic using Brookfield Avenue which is already very high particularly at certain times of the day eg beginning and the end of the school day.	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO254 regarding open space and design - See response to PO1075 regarding the consultation
PO801	Mrs Dilys Clarke				EN128	Object	This was originally designated visual open space but has been changed with little or no consultation. It is the only area of land in this vicinity to offer a reprieve from building development which, due to the close proximity of two schools and a large housing estate is very much needed. The undeveloped land adds	- See response to PO254 regarding open space, wildlife, design and village character - See response to PO1075 regarding the consultation

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							to the aesthetic value of the area and is a haven for flora and fauna. The consultation process has always listed that access to this site is off Brookfield Avenue which is not the case and is misleading. Access is off Stoney Lane which is not an adopted road. Access can only be off Brookfield Avenue if a semi-detached property is demolished. None of the other residents of Brookfield Avenue were consulted on this suggestion which should it be approved would completely ruin the look and feel of what is a traditional avenue. The demolition of just one semi-detached house would barely give enough space for the new residents and services to access the development. The scale of the development is also of a concern. The proposal to build twenty houses in comparison to the other preferred sites is of a very high density and would therefore impact negatively on the environment and local residents. The twenty properties would be very small and out of character with the very large properties on Stoney Lane and the traditional detached and semi-detached properties on Brookfield Avenue. Brookfield Avenue is the only adopted road for local residents and the nearby estate residents and heavily used hence the additional traffic would further increase dangers in the avenue and at the junction of the avenue and the A53 Leek Road. Parking is currently an unresolved issue at school times where double yellow lines have done little to prevent parents from both schools dropping off pupils, parking on the pavements, in front of residents drives or turning around in the avenue or at the junction itself. A new estate half way up the avenue would quickly become a new dropping off point, parking and turning around area. A small brook borders the edge of the site and any development would impact on drainage which can currently be overwhelmed in heavy rain.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding
PO847	Mr Paul Bradbury				EN128	Object	We are concerned about increased flood risk posed by adding 20 properties to an already over-stretched water disposal system. As you will be aware the locality has combined storm and waste water disposal which is already under severe pressure during heavy rainfall. Over the last 25 years we have witnessed incidents when the drains are unable to cope resulting in flooding along the main road. It cannot make good sense to add extra load onto a system which is already struggling to cope. Additional housing must not be considered until after existing capacity issues have been proven to be successfully resolved. At the recent drop in session we enquired about Severn Trent development plans for the area, We were assured by SMDC that questions had been asked but ST had not yet responded. Assuming ST make no significant changes and given that the council is aware of the current and future flood risk, would SMDC be prepared to accept liability if our home is flooded following the introduction of new housing.	See response to PO4469 regarding flooding
PO3858	Mr Spencer Hodgetts				EN128	Object	We are now writing to confirm our objections to the above which were listed on our letter of the 10 th September last in the hope	See response to PO254

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO3881 PO3880	Mr Clive Cartlidge Mr & Mrs P and J Salmon						that we are not wasting our own time and opinions with regard its development as forgone conclusion. The near residents and likeminded Endon residents can now only hope that, following thorough site inspection and site inspection of the properties Stoney Lane and Brookfield Avenue and view the lane itself, it will be realised by responsible counsellors and planning Officers alike how important it is to preserve the character of this last unique area of Endon for amenity it is and not build over it because the space is there to fill.	
PO3878	Mr Clive Cartlidge				EN128	Object	We are told that a certain number of houses are required to be built in Endon and we understand that several small pockets of land spread all around the village have been identified. Small sites more suitable for start homes would be less intrusive and cause less ill feeling and traffic problems. As it is, we, who live here, can rely on Councillors and planners to treat our area as would treat their own.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO148 regarding infill sites
PO1398	Mr A Dean				EN128	Object	We like many of our local residents are totally opposed to this development. It is going to increase the traffic problems of cars which is already a nightmare at peak periods during the school run – leaving hours cars are parked in Brookfield Avenue a lot part of Hazelwood Rd every day, blocking a part of section of the road) Not only is it madness to increase the problem but it will further urbanise the area that people pay high rates + house prices to retain the semi-rural aspects of Endon. I think it is the duty of the Council and its officers to serve the residents well. Knowing the majority is totally opposed to it	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO254 regarding village character and design
PO3907	Mrs H Hatcher				EN128	Object	We object to the plans for Hillswood Drive for the same reasons of access problems and noise plus scale of the development (with no plans to enhance amenities of infrastructure). Also we are concerned about the type of development planned for the canal side sites – being a safe and secure, beautiful setting it would be at the risk of crime and disturbance should travellers or social housing be given approval. We have just had our property valued, should any development diminish the financial investment we have made we will take all this up with the council directly.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO254 regarding design and residential amenity • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO148 regarding property value
PO3886	Mr and Mrs G Ruddle				EN128	Object	We reject this site as a possible building land to be included in the SMDC local plan and that it should remain as Private Visual Open Space as the previous plan. The visual open space makes a contribution to the open and semi-rural character of the neighbourhood and should be retained. There is no suitable access for proposed type of the development. Brookfield Avenue has a problem of school traffic with 2 schools adjoining which causes chaos at school time. The open space is important for wildlife, birds, etc. Both existing schools are currently oversubscribed. Flooding is a major problem in Endon in low lying areas caused by our lack of work to water courses and streams.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding open space, village character and wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1959	Mr and Mrs A & M Payne				EN128	Object	With regard to the proposed development of Dollis Field has the council taken into account the following problems which will be caused by this proposed development:- 1: At this moment in time the only access to Dollis Field is via Stoney Lane which is hardly suitable for the vehicles of residents who use it at present as this is only presumably what was originally a country lane. It is assumed therefore that houses on Brookfield Avenue will have to be demolished to allow an entrance to be made to the new houses and again the width of Brookfield Avenue is unsuitable for yet more vehicles due to the school traffic twice a day. You will probably say yes but there are single and double yellow lines the length of the road – these however are completely ignored by the school traffic and sometimes it can be quite dangerous driving up and down Brookfield Avenue as not only do you have to weave in and out of the parked vehicles but also have to keep an eye on the children who walk in groups across the pavement and sometimes spill out onto the road. 2: The other danger of additional vehicles on Brookfield Avenue is at the bottom with its junction with the A53 which as you will know is an extremely busy road and on some occasions there have been near misses due to congestion with vehicles attempting to enter and leave Brookfield Avenue. 3. Therefore it is very apparent that Brookfield Avenue cannot cope with any additional vehicles entering or leaving as one day there could be a serious accident. 4. The problems are compounded as this is also a route in and out for vehicles from Hazelwood Road and the roads leading off it as most people do not use Basnetts Wood at the other end as this road is unadopted and full of enormous holes. I trust you will take these points into account when making your decision.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO1294	Mr Joseph Johnson				EN128		Traffic congestion at the a53 with Brookfield avenue why add to the present traffic congestion when there is 2 possible alternate sites. EN012 and the 2 on Highview Road Endon	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways - See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites
PO424	Mr & Mrs J. A. & C Hamnett	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	EN128	Support	STONE LANE, ENDON – SITE EN128 My clients Mr & Mrs J. A. & C Hamnett of Dollisfield, Stoney Lane, Endon, Stoke-on-Trent, ST9 9BX, who are the owners of Site EN128, welcome and support the inclusion of the site in the preferred draft allocations for inclusion in the Local Plan. The site is located within the built-up area and the existing development boundary of the village and is the only site, of the three proposed, which is within the built-up area of the village and does not require removal from the Green Belt. The site is well located within the village and would be a good site for affordable as well as open market dwellings. There are three possible accesses – from both ends of Stoney Lane which is an un-adopted road and via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue onto Brookfield Avenue. The latter property (a semi-detached house), which is owned by Mr & Mrs Hamnett, could be demolished, if required, to provide a third access. The 2015 SHLAA Site Assessment form identified that the site has	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							excellent residential potential for up to 27 houses. The SHLAA Site Assessment form scored the site's availability as a "2" and the overall classification as a "B". This was because ownership details had not been submitted. The ownership details and the fact that the site could be immediately available for development were sent to the Council as part of the Site Options consultation in 2015. I can re-confirm that the site is in single ownership and is available for immediate development. The Sustainability Appraisal in the Council's "Options Assessment" considers that the proposed development of the site would have a positive effect as could the site's proximity to services and facilities. The Council commissioned Ecological Survey concluded that the site has a fairly low biodiversity value overall although there is a tree with bat roosting potential and a species rich hedgerow. At this stage the client believes that the best way to develop the site is build three distinct cells/clusters of houses each with its own separate access – one cell accessed from Brookfields Avenue; one from the western end of Stoney Lane; and the other from the eastern end of Stoney Lane. However, the final design would depend on discussions with the Council and Highways. The site was previously identified in the former Local Plan as an important visual open space. This policy no longer applies and the site is no longer designated as such. In the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessments carried out in support of the Core Strategy the recommendation is that the site is not (my underline) suitable as Visual Open Space and that the site appears to be suitable for sympathetic development. Development on the site would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape character and would not be particularly visible. There is a Tree Preservation Order on the site however I am told that one of the two trees in question has been felled (relevant permission obtained) as it was badly diseased and dangerous and, that the other is in a poor condition.. Economically the development of the site will support the existing services in the village and, if required, would help improve services and facilities. Socially, development would help ease the shortage of housing land supply in the District and village and could provide much need needed affordable housing. Environmentally, development of this site lessens the pressure on the Green Belt.	
PO264	mr anthony williamson				EN128	Object	I am to strongly object about the building of houses in Endon, especially the proposed development off Stoney Lane. I live in Hazelwood Road and the Brookfield Avenue is already congested in the mornings and late afternoons with parents dropping their children off at the two nearby schools. Extra houses would equate to extra cars and even more congestion.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO4836					EN128	General comment	Undecided.	• Comment noted
PO4469	Mr and Mrs F.A Downing				EN128	Object	As we were away when the meeting took place, we feel we must voice our objections, even at this late stage. Since living in Post Lane for 39 years the bulk of the traffic and speed at what it has increased tremendously, putting extreme stress on the old canal bridge in this old part of the Endon village. Putting up extra homes in the immediate vicinity will exacerbate the situation with a daily exit of cars and people using the country lane with little or no pavements now used as a short cut by HGV's! Surely these are accidents waiting to happen! Owing to the fact that the dwellings are to build on the low lying fields that are often flooded, is not a good idea. We would like you to consider the implications of this site and choose an alternative one as we deem this to be unsuitable.	• The Highways Authority advises that the site is developable subject to adequate visibility although will require access improvements/ third party land; or demolition of property if via Brookfield Avenue (and has not ruled out the latter as an option). • The Environment Agency did not raise any site specific issues. Staffordshire County Council as LLFA identified potential flood risk issues, recommend flood risk assessment and early engagement with County Council
PO3871	Mr G B Chatfield				EN128	Object	More properly on this lane would only increase traffic in in Brookfield Avenue which even now gets blocked at school times. The extra traffic would endanger school children. The proposed development, to gain access to Brookfield Avenue would not give sufficient room for the road that would give good site at Brookhouse Junction.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO3872	Ms Pauline Daniels				EN128	Object	More houses in a very small area will cause further congestion on Brookfield Avenue as the Avenue is not very wide and already suffers from congestion at peak times when children attending St Lukes primary and Endon High School are dropped off. It is already difficult to get out onto the A53 without road fitting into Brookfield Avenue bringing congestion. Traffic convergences from other homes in Hazlewood Road, Cedar Avenue, Stoney Lane, Woodstone Avenue and Bassnetts Wood and so at peak times it is very busy and difficult to get onto the A53 building and construction traffic will add further problems. Cars have to park on the pavement to enable the traffic to get down the road – please see photographs attached – taken on a quiet day. More houses mean extra school places and demands on Drs Surgeries.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
								additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO3874	Mr and Mrs S Tinsley				EN128	Object	Access to Dollisfield no double access at the present time. Question what options for access available if properties were built how would this affect the water flow of the stream, at the moment this is unhindered, concerns over damage to the stream during building and impact on surrounding properties size of suggested 20 properties and if access suitability of the area behind a school and if access from Brookfield which falls between two schools. Concerns rose over extra properties and number of extra residents and children. School places plus health services in surrounding area. Amount of increased road traffic on Brookfield Avenue is dangerous for children for the two schools. Extra traffic from Brookfield at busy times onto main Leek Road Endon.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure
PO1418	Mr P Deaville				EN128	Object	Brookfield Ave being situated between 2 schools already has it problems with cars (parking to pick up children) the building of more houses on this site will mean more vehicles have to access the site and will cause more congestion at the junction of Brookfield Ave and A53	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO3875	Mr and Mrs S Tinsley				EN128	Object	The access to this site wherever it is will make a big impact on this very busy Avenue at school times access from the A53 is often blocked making it impossible for emergency vehicles and dangerous for the children, more houses and building will make a bad problem worse and endanger life.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO254	Mr and Mrs A.J. Eardley				EN128	Object	Brookfield Avenue was originally designed as a minor residential road. It now caters for the traffic delivering to and from a High School, a Primary School and houses along Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Woodside Avenue and Basnetts Wood. To further increase this traffic by cars/lorries/emergency vehicles etc for a further 20 houses would overload the infrastructure and compromise the safety of pupils walking to and from school and traffic emerging from the junction at Leek Road. Our primary concerns are as follows: The proximity of the proposed access road via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue to our driveway (No 12) would be less than 2.5 metres (assuming a footpath of 2m alongside the proposed access road). We do not have space to turn cars around in our driveway so would therefore need to either reverse in or out across the face of the proposed access road junction. Any increase in volume of traffic using Brookfield Avenue would make it unsafe for children to play outside. Local children currently cycle, skateboard and play ball in the road outside our house and this would be unthinkable with another junction within Brookfield Avenue. Primary and High School children have to cross Brookfield Avenue twice a day in order to get to school and the junction with Leek Road, at which they cross, would become even more hazardous. Traffic noise and pollution levels would be raised from vehicles waiting to exit the junction from Brookfield Avenue onto Leek Road. This would	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application • Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the area is maintained. The • Whilst the site is currently identified as Visual Open Space, the site was not identified for retention as such in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. The Council is not obliged to retain this designation. Therefore the site was included as a potential housing option. • New housing schemes depending on their size will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							further increase associated health problems for people living in the vicinity and at both the Primary and High schools. Brookfield Avenue is used as a pick up and drop off point for children using the two schools. Vehicles travel to the top of the road and turn at the end before dropping their children off. There is no through route for this so every vehicle travels up and down the road and a queue already develops at the junction to the main road, compromising safety of pedestrians and vehicles attempting to enter Brookfield Avenue from the main road. Traffic queues back onto the main road even though double yellow lines have been painted at the junction (cars still park on them). The extended traffic queues and the additional junction within Brookfield Avenue would compromise access to driveways. Specifically relating to the proposed access road as a result of demolishing No 14 Brookfield Avenue our concerns are as follows: There would be an unacceptable level of noise and pollution from traffic using the proposed access road directly alongside our property, which is built right up to the boundary between No 12 and No 14 Brookfield Avenue. There would be an unacceptable level of light pollution from traffic using the proposed access road and any necessary street lighting required for public safety in such close proximity to our property. The demolition of No.14 and the construction of the proposed access road would cause disturbance to our property, which is built right up to the boundary. Construction traffic in the process of building 20 new houses would create an unacceptable level of noise, dust and inconvenience. The space available between the boundaries of No 12 and No 16 would not provide sufficient width for an access road with the required visibility splay at the junction with Brookfield Avenue. Environmental issues regarding any building on Dollisfield (EN128) would severely impact on the current properties in the surrounding area. Flooding of Leek Road (and the houses alongside) in the vicinity of site EN128 is a recurrent issue due to rainfall runoff from the adjacent hillside. Any building on Dollisfield would exacerbate this, since the field currently serves as a natural soak-away. Previous flooding has resulted in failure of street lighting in Brookfield Avenue. The current drainage system is clearly insufficient and would only be further compromised by greater surface water due to increased development and lack of soak-away. Rivers have been seen and filmed coming down Brookfield Avenue within recent years with resultant damage to property. St Luke's Primary School playing fields are currently inaccessible to children until Easter each year due to the soggy nature of the field. Any development in Dollisfield would make this much worse. The Government's own planning policy demands new developments take into account the health and well being of residents. Children need their playing fields. EN128 has been designated Visual Open Space. This is essential to maintain the semi-rural feel of Endon and the	as the consideration of new links in line with Local Plan policy. - The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site had fairly low biodiversity value <i>"The site has fairly low biodiversity value overall and the site is set within a mainly urban environment with poor connectivity to the wider countryside."</i> - If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							health of people living here. The wildlife living within and around the field provides the soundtrack appropriate to a semi-rural neighbourhood and this would be obliterated by the proposed development.	
PO105	Mr James Shaw				EN128	Object	Building 20 extra houses just off Brookfield Avenue will make an already busy junction with the A53 (Leek Road) even busier as well as building on valuable green space.	See response to PO4469 regarding traffic and PO254 regarding open space
PO175	Mrs Heather Djuranovic				EN128	Object	I attended the consultation session at Endon Village Hall and took the opportunity to talk to representatives of the Council about the proposed site EN128. It was explained to me that it would be highly unlikely that the council would support knocking down a semi detached house to create access for the site. It was suggested that Stony Lane would need to become an adopted road. I posed the question about the fact that it is a narrow lane; how would it work? This is what I understood to true: Once an adopted road Stony lane would have to become a 'one way street' If Developers can't get the road adopted the site would not be considered If the road is adopted and developers still wish to create another entrance to the site they can apply for permission to demolish the semi (owned by the land owner) My opposition for the consideration of EN128 is this: Traffic congestion in the vicinity of the proposed site, particularly at school opening and closing times, is a major problem, causing hold-ups and backlogs for up to 2 miles, and causing difficulty for joining traffic from side-roads, i.e. Platts Avenue, Kent Drive, Spencer Avenue, Greenmeadow Grove. Increased traffic flow on Brookfield Avenue, Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Basnetts Wood and the parking of vehicles in these areas for up to 1 hour around school closing times, causes a traffic hazard due to the difficulty in gaining access and egress for other road users, residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc. Parking restrictions introduced in the last two years are largely ignored. Once adopted Stoney Lane would become a Rat Run for School traffic, with cars travelling in a loop around the proposed site. Residents of Brookfield Avenue already find it difficult to negotiate this traffic without the addition of even more residents that a new development presents. Brookfield Avenue is flanked on both sides by un-adopted roads (Basnetts Wood & Stoney Lane) which make the Brookfield Avenue turning a very busy one; even without School time traffic. Above all, the increase in traffic would be of greater danger to pedestrians walking to and from the schools either side of Brookfield Avenue. All of the CURRENT issues described within this comment can be evidenced with videos that clearly show the impact of heavy traffic.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO1075	Ms Carol Burton				EN128	Object	I strongly oppose the proposed development of this site en128 as a preferred option ' The site is wholly inappropriate: a concentration of houses in this area would result in increased problems with traffic , overloaded service infrastructure, damage	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							to the environment, negative impact to the wellbeing of local residents. I put forward the following points to substantiate my objection. Additional housing in this site would generate more traffic using the Brookfield Avenue approach already carries a large amount of traffic. In addition to its own houses it provides access to Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Avenue and its adjoining cul-de-sacs. The volume of traffic is added to at school times when car parking still causes congestion and considerable inconvenience to local residents. Parking restrictions are in place at school times but they are regularly ignored. Not only do drivers park on single yellow lines at the junction of Brookfield Avenue and the A53 Leek Road. The latter practice is hazardous as drivers turning into the avenue may still be faced with an unexpected obstruction. Pedestrians too, many of them school children, are particularly at risk at these times. The congestion from parked cars often causes passing vehicles to be driven on the pavement while it is being used by pedestrians. This is highly dangerous and illegal manoeuvre. Additional traffic from a further concentration of housing would undoubtedly add to the existing problems and dangers of an already overcrowded avenue may undoubtedly add to the existing problems and dangers of an already overcrowded avenue. Vehicle frequently use the junctions of Brookfield Avenue/A53 and Brookfield Avenue/Stoney Lane for turning. This is not limited to light vehicles but also trucks (not involved in deliveries in the Avenue) and more recently, a number of buses have been seen using the Avenue as a turning facility. If the access from Brookfield Avenue to a new development was to be as suggested on the original Site Assessment Form it would offer a 3rd turning area and in doing so, create another potentially dangerous. Brookfield Avenue is an attractive avenue – not just a subjective view but one frequently expressed by people from outside the area, including international visitors. The suggestion of using no 14, half a semidetached house as a possible access point as shown on the original plan in 2015, would ruin the whole character and aspect of the avenue for existing residents. In any case it doubtful whether the space occupied by this property is of sufficient width to provide a fully operational roadway and pavements within legal requirements. Furthermore, it appears perverse that the proposed demolition of a existing house would contribute to solving the housing shortage. The proposed site borders a Primary School with a playing field which would be overlooked by the proposed houses. Children engage in sports activities and play near the boundary. Development of this site would be of serious concerns about safeguarding of young pupils. Several Water courses exist in the vicinity. At times of heavy rain the drains struggle/fail to cope with that so that rainwater would significantly flowing down Brookfield Avenue leads to a build-up of water on the A53. Further strain and	• See response to PO254 regarding village character and residential amenity • The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. • Resident's views have been sought as part of the consultation. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							pressure on the drainage infrastructure from additional housing would significantly increase the problem. The SMDC has gone to great lengths to involve residents across the district to engage in the consultation procedures. To discover that the site EN128 has emerged as a preferred option despite our local village council's representation on our behalf as well as many known objections submitted by residents makes one wonder whether the whole 'consultation process has simply been a cosmetic exercise to placate residents and give an impression of democratic involvement. A preferred option – preferred by whom? Other more suitable sites exist. The Endon Parish Council has I understand already objected to the development of this site. It has also formulated an alternative, more acceptable and more workable plan which would have resolve many of the problems which would be caused by the original plan put forward by SMDC. I strongly propose that SMDC should listen and take note of the views that this plan should be the 1 to follow for the benefit of all the Endon Residents who are affected. By this development issue.	
PO693	MRS Melanie Thomas				EN128	Object	I wish to object to this site on the following grounds: Infrastructure – schools Infrastructure – traffic Flood risk Amenity – noise/light pollution, loss of wildlife Scale of development Government Policy The site is designated as Visual Open Space to protect the semi rural feel of the village and offer a break in development. Due to significant house building in Endon over the last 20 years, which has seen infill development erode the majority of natural breaks between properties, it is now more vital than ever to protect remaining open spaces within the centre of the village. Although the site was not identified for retention as Visual Open Space in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment, Core Strategy directs that existing open spaces should be retained. 20 years ago planning applications for this site were rejected by the local Parish Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, who both fully supported the community's view that this VOS was significantly important to Endon village. When the applicant appealed the decision to refuse planning consent, the Planning Inspector upheld the District council's decision, acknowledging the value of the open site as a community asset. Nothing has changed since to justify the destruction of this designation and it is even more vital to protect the few remaining open spaces to preserve the 'village' identity. The Parish council have recently reaffirmed their support to maintain the VOS on this site by voting, as part of this consultation exercise, to reject EN128 as suitable for development. The existing gateway to the site is on Stoney Lane, an unadopted, extremely narrow lane (and Bridleway) which is highly unsuitable to accommodate increased traffic volumes. The proposed alternative access via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue would require demolition of one semi	• See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, design, residential amenity and open space • See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations • The previous planning application refusal was under the existing planning policy at the time the consultation is on proposals to update planning policy and provide a new Local Plan • See response to PO254 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							detached property, which would adversely impact on the adjoining property (No, 16) and spoil the aesthetic appearance of the Avenue. One half of a pair of semi-detached houses left standing would look ridiculous and not in keeping with other remaining properties. It is highly doubtful that the space created by knocking down No.14 would provide an access road sufficiently wide enough for 2 passing vehicles and a pavement, in which case No.16 would also require demolition. To demolish well maintained, mature properties in order to build new homes is perverse and would undermine the site's capacity deliver the projected number of new homes. To create a mini estate off Brookfield Avenue would exacerbate the existing traffic problems, caused by pupils being dropped off and picked up from Endon High and St Luke's Primary schools. The Avenue is already blighted by heavy parking, congestion at both ends of the school day and dangerous manoeuvres by inconsiderate drivers, despite the installation of double yellow and single yellow line parking restrictions. 27 proposed properties on this site could realistically generate an additional 40-50 vehicles (plus visitors) per day using the bottom section of Brookfield Avenue, and at its busiest point - where it joins the A53. This would create more traffic chaos and further reduce the safety of schoolchildren and residents, as school parking would extend into the new cul-de-sac and drivers would use the access road as an additional turning point. EN128 is problematic as a potential site due to its proximity to a water course. To gain access from Brookfield Avenue it would be necessary to build a road/bridge over the existing brook. In recent years during heavy rainfall, the level of the brook has been extremely high. Additionally, following construction of a new house at the top of Brookfield Avenue, there have been flooding problems down the full length of the road. Any further development would only serve to seriously increase the risk of flooding. I strongly disagree with the Site Assessment Form's statement that 'a high density here would be in keeping with surroundings'. It is difficult to comprehend how a Density of 38.03 could possibly be justified. Taking account of the natural brook, which runs between the site and rear gardens on Brookfield Avenue, any new properties would need to be built some distance from the water course – which would reduce the available space. Considering also the need for access roads to each area of the site, it would seem highly unlikely that the site could accommodate anywhere near 27 properties, even if they were small 'affordable' starter homes. This reduces the viability of using this site to help deliver the required number of houses in the village. On one boundary of the site is an open school playing field, with a large detached property/gardens forming the second. Detached/semi-detached properties on good sized plots in Brookfield Avenue form the third boundary, with the characterful Stoney Lane forming the	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							fourth boundary. This comprises mature, predominantly large properties situated on very generous plots and the road is one of the oldest in the village, being an unadopted lane and bridleway. Therefore a high density housing development would be completely out of keeping in this location and would spoil the aesthetic appearance of the area. How can a site which has been recognised for many years as a valuable Visual Open Space and an amenity for the village now be deemed suitable for a high density housing development? Any construction on this site will cause significant loss of amenity to local residents; from loss of views/outlook onto an open meadow, to resulting light pollution and noise pollution. It would adversely impact on the habitats of the natural wildlife, particularly birds which thrive here, and destroy the peace and tranquillity which has benefitted generations of local residents. Those living in properties on Brookfield Avenue and Stoney Lane would see the quietness of this location destroyed. Even with the windows closed you can hear a constant and wonderful variety of birdsong, which creates a real sense of rural life and serves to enhance the local area for everyone. The loss of this open space, which was a major consideration when most of the residents moved here, would be immense and would also result in a significant reduction in the value of nearby properties. To infill this site would also have a detrimental impact on the open aspect of St Luke's school playing field. The semi-rural feel of the children's outdoor space would disappear and the view and noise arising from development would negatively impact on the quality of school life. Since the school was built generations of children have enjoyed the benefits of this meadow which borders their playing field. To develop in this location would not only ruin the semi rural feel of the school, and change its environment by completely enclosing it, but would also be failing to plan for the longer term future of the village and its need for recreational space. The proposed number of new houses to be built in Endon (Stanley & Brown Edge) will put further pressure on local schools, which the District Council already accepts are oversubscribed. St Luke's has already extended its buildings onto the adjoining playing field and removed the 'wildlife area' to compensate. With increased demand from more pupils there is a real risk that it would need to extend further onto its recreational field, reducing the openness even more. Rather than seek to destroy this open space for housing, I strongly believe it makes more sense to protect the Visual Open Space and retain the future option of utilising it as a recreational playing field for the schools/children in the community. Access could be gained off the A53 via St Luke's school. This would provide a much better use of the site and serve the longer term needs of the village and its school children. I believe that the District Council should listen more to the views of Endon with Stanley Parish	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Council and local residents, as they will have to live with the consequences of any development in our village. Rather than build high numbers of properties in 4 locations I believe it is preferable to build a few homes situated around the village, to limit the impact of any development. I propose the following alternative sites as more suitable for development than EN128: EN030 - I support the construction of 4 dwellings, at the bottom of this site/close to the lane, as long as they are of a traditional design and in keeping with the immediate surroundings. If this was delivered in a similar way to the dwellings built on the site of the former smithy, there would be minimal impact on the old village. EN024 - I support some development on this site as density/capacity is extremely low and dwellings would be well screened from the A53 by trees, therefore impact on landscape would be minimal. Access already exists via Greenmeadow Grove and any increased traffic volumes would be small. Very few number of vehicles access the A53 from this point, so congestion would not be an issue. EN137 - I support a small number of properties on this site, as it is well screened from most sides. Even after development there would remain a significant area of open space in this location, which would help to minimise the impact.	
PO275	Mrs Carol Burton				EN128	Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: There is a huge groundswell of opinion against this proposal. The number of objections outweighs the number of councillors who voted for this 'option' The site is within a few metres of a water course. The building of many more dwellings and attendant problems of substantial road and sewerage development would be unsustainable [photos attached to letter]. The plan shows access through one semi detached house on Brookfield Avenue, breaking it in two and causing disruption to already heavy traffic in the process. There is no room for an exit road through the centre of the avenue. Another alleged route is .. the junction of Stoney Lane. There is a high volume of traffic already on the avenue at school times. Children are already at considerable risk of traffic. Dollisfield has long been designated 'visual open space' and as such is essential to the well being of local residents who have to endure heavy traffic. Dollisfield borders the school playing field. St Luke's Primary School's quiet area is adjacent to this field. The VOS contributes to pupils' well being. More housing would mean that the school would be hemmed in. Dollisfield supports a wide variety of plant and animal life (includes oak TPO). Local residents and pupils get pleasure from observing wildlife. To build on this land would be to upset the eco-balance of the area. Queries different descriptions on site assessment form as being contradictory. Please restore faith in SMDC and represent the people who elected you. Use Endon Parish Council as the model to achieve the best for your constituents. Endon Parish Council	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding village character, wildlife, open space and residential amenity • The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. • The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							has not shied away from finding APPROPRIATE sites and coming up with a very viable alternative plan.	
PO148	Mr Malcolm Dale				EN128	Object	Reasons for response Please identify the issues relevant to your response. Infrastructure - schools Infrastructure - traffic/transport Infrastructure - other Landscape Nature conservation Flood risk Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) Scale of development Other Do you have any comments? Impact on traffic volume and flow/Health and Safety A traffic survey undertaken approximately 2 years ago found that 17,000 vehicles a day pass through Endon on the A53. A letter dated 6th January 1984 (in our possession) from the Dept of Environment and Transport re proposed buildings on this site at that time (1983), in answer to an appeal by the executors of Harry Taylor (dec'd) states ".....the effect of your client's proposal upon the traffic flow along Brookfield Avenue. In my judgment the balance of argument is overwhelmingly that this appeal must fail". This is even more relevant now with the increased volume of traffic. Traffic congestion in the vicinity of the proposed site, particularly at school opening and closing times, is a major problem, causing hold-ups and backlogs for up to 2 miles, and causing difficulty for joining traffic from side-roads, i.e. Platts Avenue, Kent Drive, Spencer Avenue, Greenmeadow Grove. The junction of Station Road and Clay Lake with the A53 is already a difficult junction to negotiate with limited visibility. Increased traffic flow on Brookfield Avenue, Stoney Lane, Hazelwood Road, Basnetts Wood and the parking of vehicles in these areas for up to 1 hour around school closing times, causes a traffic hazard due to the difficulty in gaining access and egress for other road users, residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc. Parking restrictions introduced in the last two years are largely ignored and have only resulted in stationary traffic moving from Brookfield Avenue to Cedar Crescent and Hazelwood Road. This is a hazard to the increasingly elderly population in this vicinity. The current volume of traffic as detailed above is also a danger to school children, pedestrians and all other road users. When driving in these areas avoiding action is often needed to prevent accidents/collisions. Access . Proposed access to the site is from Brookfield Avenue. This alone would not provide a wide enough access to the site. The entry radii need to be sufficient to accommodate the swept path of all vehicles and would add further to the congestion. Access to and from the site via Brookfield Avenue could not support the potential increase of up to 54 residents' vehicles and additional related traffic throughout the day and particularly at school times and peak time traffic. Stoney Lane is an unadopted road and is not wide enough to provided suitable access to the site. Impact on schools. Increased demand on already over-subscribed schools in the area due to a potential increase in the size of the school population. Flooding . Heavy rain in recent years (notably 2013) caused flash flooding	• See response to PO4469 regarding flooding and highways • See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, residential amenity, village character and open space • See response PO 3872 regarding infrastructure • Loss of property values are not a material planning consideration • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							throughout the village, particularly in Stoney lane and Brookfield Avenue to a depth of at least 18 inches, and extending on to the A53 and further afield, causing damage to some properties and severely restricting access. Designated Visual Open Space. The site has been designated a Visual Open Space for at least 20+ years. Regardless of what any owner of the space may do to restrict the visual impact, e.g. planting trees/hedges, the site remains a visual open space. This site occupies a visually prominent position and contributes to the spaciousness of this area. Any building on this site would harm the openness, character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not add visual value to the area. To build on this site would urbanise the area even further and impact detrimentally on the village character. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states that pursuing sustainable development also involves seeking positive improvements to the quality of the built and natural environment. I consider that site EN128 should retain its current 'Designated Visual Open Space' status which has been in operation for at least 30 years. The loss of this open space would be visually, aesthetically and environmentally detrimental to the surrounding built-up residential area. Property values. Low cost housing would not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding properties and could have a detrimental effect on their value, with the subsequent negative impact on residents. Preferred Development Areas/Sites Before any Greenbelt land is reclassified in Endon village all Brownfield sites should be fully exhausted. In addition any proposed site should be considered which would have minimal impact to existing residents. One site, EN130, and the site opposite to EN130 between the Black Horse and lay-by (on the left while heading towards Longsdon) which I understand was removed from later versions; should be considered first. These would provide direct access onto the A53 without having a negative effect on existing junctions, would allow infrastructure to connect easily and would reduce the risk of flooding. It would also not impact any Green Belt vistas. I consider that this area could be sufficient to accommodate all the building requirements in Endon for the specified period.	
PO1477	Mr Neville Mayer				EN128	Object	Residents in bassnets wood road, hazelwood road, woodstone ave. Cedars cress and stoney lane have no reasonable access to the a53 except via Brookfield ave. The ave (along with parts of Stoney lane/hazelwood road already caters for vehicle taking twice a day for children attending St Lukes & the high street such parking also involves drivers making 360degree turns in the mouth of Brookfield avenue with the A%3 likewise on the right angle bend of brookfield ave with stoney lane. All this dangerous traffic movement are a conflict with pedestrians (particularly children) arriving on foot to attend the local 2 schools in addition the 2 pedestrian crossings, wardens for the schools generate traffic hold ups In both directions on the A53 itself, thereby	See response to PO4469 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							interfering with the flow of the traffic entering and exiting Brookfield venue. The added mix of pedestrian's movement generated by the erection of 27 dwellings on site EN128 surely makes this a non-starter Not with standing all of the above, if the site was to be developed I consider that planning permission should be granted on the basis of a section 107 agreement whereby bassnetts wood road was 'made up' the developer for its total length to the highway auth requirements. This would trouble the much needs additional access point onto the a53 work that's long overdue!	
PO9541	Miss Christine Daniels				EN128	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: more houses means more cars, more congestion, inconvenience to current residents. Narrow road. Additional strain on schools, doctors surgeries etc Brookfield Ave is narrow, which joins the extremely busy A53. Already traffic from nearby housing estate roads which converge on Brookfield Ave before joining A53. Extremely congested particularly at school times. if access is to be halfway along Brookfield Ave subsequent traffic would double bottleneck and enhance hazards to pedestrians/schoolchildren/drivers. refer to attached photos that demonstrate congestion.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure
PO9542	Mr and Mrs J. Durber				EN128	Object	Response form/letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN128: totally reject site for building land. Have been involved since 1995 in fighting to keep EN128 as field of local importance and from an amenity, noise and privacy point of view. In last Structure Plan SMDC with Parish Council and residents, won over the field to be retained as Visual Open Space. The [Government] Inspector recommended that the land be retained as VOS and that the land provided an important contribution to the open and semi-rural character of the neighbourhood and should be retained on amenity grounds. He also stated that there were no grounds for allocating additional land for housing in this location. We believe this is still the case. Question what has changed to this VOS in last 20 years Owner has removed this VOS for all concerned. Has grown dense hedges around boundaries of site, and removed oak trees. VOS has gradually been eroded against everything Inspector stated. site is landlocked unless houses demolished (unlikely), or if redevelopment of Stoney Lane. Stormwater drainage to site (also 3 streams in vicinity). Occasional flooding causing major problems. extra water to stormwater drainage will make drainage system worse, to ultimate outfall. safety concerns for schoolchildren and parents (Endon High and St Lukes schools). Car parking on nearby roads and pavements, double parking etc. A53 congested particularly at school times. Recent car smashes. schools presently over-committed. transport infrastructure not sufficient, need updating/renewing. Sewers and underground electric services need renewing. flooding a major problem in Endon low lying areas, caused by over development and lack of	• See response to PO254 regarding residential amenity, design open space and village character • See response to PO4469 regarding flooding • See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							work to local watercourses. question whether Endon sewage works capable of taking additional sewage/water; whether would cause flooding. conservation - greenfields, woodlands etc being eroded for housebuilding. Question if there are "brownfield areas" that could be used first. local people's views ignored, or misled. QUESTION WHY WE NEED ALL THESE HOUSES - Council need to give justified reasons (other than raising £1000/year per new homes bonus). Thousands of properties for sale or empty. Council's proposals for Endon should be scrapped. Instead Council should adopt Endon Parish Council proposals (Hewitt & Carr).	
PO3887	Mrs Angela Jones				EN128	Object	School traffic still a terrible problem in Brookfield Avenue with drivers still waiting Brookfield Avenue even with yellow lines and restricted parking hours put into place with no-one policing this. Drivers are still stopping of and picking up children here, especially on the corner of the avenue leaving vehicle's mainly residents vehicles trying to access their properties queuing on the main road. The problem traffic has been pushed into Hazelwood Road leaving residents here sometimes having the same problems. Putting more houses and therefore more vehicles into an already nightmare is just an accident waiting to happen here.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO708 PO704 PO741 PO755 PO733 PO738	MR Kevin Thomas MR Ray Austin MR James Thomas MR Joseph Thomas Miss Beth Thomas MR David Thomas				EN128	Object	The site is designated as Visual Open Space to protect the semi rural feel of the village and offer a break in development. Due to significant house building in Endon over the last 20 years, which has seen infill development erode the majority of natural breaks between properties, it is now more vital than ever to protect remaining open spaces within the centre of the village. Although the site was not identified for retention as Visual Open Space in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment, Core Strategy directs that existing open spaces should be retained. 20 years ago planning applications for this site were rejected by the local Parish Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, who both fully supported the community's view that this VOS was significantly important to Endon village. When the applicant appealed the decision to refuse planning consent, the Planning Inspector upheld the District council's decision, acknowledging the value of the open site as a community asset. Nothing has changed since to justify the destruction of this designation and it is even more vital to protect the few remaining open spaces to preserve the 'village' identity. The Parish council have recently reaffirmed their support to maintain the VOS on this site by voting, as part of this consultation exercise, to reject EN128 as suitable for development. The existing gateway to the site is on Stoney Lane, an unadopted, extremely narrow lane (and Bridleway) which is highly unsuitable to accommodate increased traffic volumes. The proposed alternative access via No.14 Brookfield Avenue would require demolition of one semi-detached property, which	- See response to PO3872 - See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO254 regarding wildlife, design, village character, open space - See response to PO693 regarding previous planning refusal - See response to PO1075 & PO275 regarding alternative sites and consultation responses from previous consultations - See response to PO254 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							would adversely impact on the adjoining property (No. 16) and spoil the aesthetic appearance of the Avenue. One half of a pair of semi-detached houses left standing would look ridiculous and not in keeping with other remaining properties. It is highly doubtful that the space created by knocking down No.14 would provide an access road sufficiently wide enough for 2 passing vehicles and a pavement, in which case No.16 would also require demolition. To demolish well maintained, mature properties in order to build new homes is perverse and would undermine the site's capacity deliver the projected number of new homes. To create a mini estate off Brookfield Avenue would exacerbate the existing traffic problems, caused by pupils being dropped off and picked up from Endon High and St Luke's Primary schools. The Avenue is already blighted by heavy parking, congestion at both ends of the school day and dangerous manoeuvres by inconsiderate drivers, despite the installation of double yellow and single yellow line parking restrictions. 27 proposed properties on this site could realistically generate an additional 40-50 vehicles (plus visitors) per day using the bottom section of Brookfield Avenue, and at its busiest point - where it joins the A53. This would create more traffic chaos and further reduce the safety of schoolchildren and residents, as school parking would extend into the new cul-de-sac and drivers would use the access road as an additional turning point. EN128 is problematic as a potential site due to its proximity to a water course. To gain access from Brookfield Avenue it would be necessary to build a road/bridge over the existing brook. In recent years during heavy rainfall, the level of the brook has been extremely high. Additionally, following construction of a new house at the top of Brookfield Avenue, there have been flooding problems down the full length of the road. Any further development would only serve to seriously increase the risk of flooding. I strongly disagree with the Site Assessment Form's statement that 'a high density here would be in keeping with surroundings'. It is difficult to comprehend how a Density of 38.03 could possibly be justified. Taking account of the natural brook, which runs between the site and rear gardens on Brookfield Avenue, any new properties would need to be built some distance from the water course – which would reduce the available space. Considering also the need for access roads to each area of the site, it would seem highly unlikely that the site could accommodate anywhere near 27 properties, even if they were small 'affordable' starter homes. This reduces the viability of using this site to help deliver the required number of houses in the village. On one boundary of the site is an open school playing field, with a large detached property/gardens forming the second. Detached/semi-detached properties on good sized plots in Brookfield Avenue form the third boundary, with the characterful Stoney Lane forming the fourth boundary. This	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							comprises mature, predominantly large properties situated on very generous plots and the road is one of the oldest in the village, being an unadopted lane and bridleway. Therefore a high density housing development would be completely out of keeping in this location and would spoil the aesthetic appearance of the area. How can a site which has been recognised for many years as a valuable Visual Open Space, and an amenity for the village, now be deemed suitable for a high density housing development? Any construction on this site will cause significant loss of amenity to local residents; from loss of views/outlook onto an open meadow, to resulting light pollution and noise pollution. It would adversely impact on the habitats of the natural wildlife, particularly birds which thrive here, and destroy the peace and tranquillity which has benefitted generations of local residents. Those living in properties on Brookfield Avenue and Stoney Lane would see the quietness of this location destroyed. Even with the windows closed you can hear a constant and wonderful variety of birdsong, which creates a real sense of rural life and serves to enhance the local area for everyone. The loss of this open space, which was a major consideration when most of the residents moved here, would be immense and would also result in a significant reduction in the value of nearby properties. To infill this site would also have a detrimental impact on the open aspect of St Luke's school playing field. The semi-rural feel of the children's outdoor space would disappear and the view and noise arising from development would negatively impact on the quality of school life. Since the school was built generations of children have enjoyed the benefits of this meadow which borders their playing field. To develop in this location would not only ruin the semi rural feel of the school, and change its environment by completely enclosing it, but would also be failing to plan for the longer term future of the village and its need for recreational space. The proposed number of new houses to be built in Endon (Stanley & Brown Edge) will put further pressure on local schools, which the District Council already accepts are oversubscribed. St Luke's has already extended its buildings onto the adjoining playing field and removed the 'wildlife area' to compensate. With increased demand from more pupils there is a real risk that it would need to extend further onto its recreational field, reducing the openness even more. Rather than seek to destroy this open space for housing, I strongly believe it makes more sense to protect the Visual Open Space and retain the future option of utilising it as a recreational playing field for the schools/children in the community. Access could be gained off the A53 via St Luke's school. This would provide a much better use of the site and serve the longer term needs of the village and its school children. I believe that the District Council should listen more to the views of Endon with Stanley Parish	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Council and local residents, as they will have to live with the consequences of any development in our village. Rather than build high numbers of properties in 4 locations I believe it is preferable to build a few homes situated around the village, to limit the impact of any development. I propose the following alternative sites as more suitable for development than EN128: EN030 - I support the construction of 4 dwellings, at the bottom of this site/close to the lane, as long as they are of a traditional design and in keeping with the immediate surroundings. If this was delivered in a similar way to the dwellings built on the site of the former smithy, there would be minimal impact on the old village. EN024 - I support some development on this site as density/capacity is extremely low and dwellings would be well screened from the A53 by trees, therefore impact on landscape would be minimal. Access already exists via Greenmeadow Grove and any increased traffic volumes would be small. Very few number of vehicles access the A53 from this point, so congestion would not be an issue. EN137 - I support a small number of properties on this site, as it is well screened from most sides. Even after development there would remain a significant area of open space in this location, which would help to minimise the impact.	
PO1419	Mr D Barker				EN128	Object	This development is likely to cause massive disruption to Brookfield both during the building stage and the additional 30/40 vehicles which will result from a further 20 residences using out already overbooked road on a daily basis. As you are well aware Brookfield avenue has already had several problems with the traffic for several years and due to its proximity of two of the schools this is exacerbation would catastrophic. I am sure there are several much better site in Endon which will not cause problems for the residents	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO147	mr neil baddeley				EN128	Object	this development would add to the problems of access in Brookfield Avenue during school drop offs and pick ups. There is already severe congestion with people parking their cars, sometimes on double yellow lines at peak times	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO750	Mr Trevor Clarke				EN128	Object	This was originally an area designated as visual open space and was changed with little consultation. There are far too many properties proposed for the size of the plot. Access is proposed by knocking down an existing property(a semi-detached), the resulting space created would be too narrow to accommodate the resulting residential and service traffic. There would be a significant increase in general traffic using Brookfield Avenue which is already very high particularly at certain times of the day eg beginning and the end of the school day.	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding - See response to PO254 regarding open space and design - See response to PO1075 regarding the consultation
PO801	Mrs Dilys Clarke				EN128	Object	This was originally designated visual open space but has been changed with little or no consultation. It is the only area of land in this vicinity to offer a reprieve from building development which, due to the close proximity of two schools and a large housing estate is very much needed. The undeveloped land adds	- See response to PO254 regarding open space, wildlife, design and village character - See response to PO1075 regarding the consultation

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							to the aesthetic value of the area and is a haven for flora and fauna. The consultation process has always listed that access to this site is off Brookfield Avenue which is not the case and is misleading. Access is off Stoney Lane which is not an adopted road. Access can only be off Brookfield Avenue if a semi-detached property is demolished. None of the other residents of Brookfield Avenue were consulted on this suggestion which should it be approved would completely ruin the look and feel of what is a traditional avenue. The demolition of just one semi-detached house would barely give enough space for the new residents and services to access the development. The scale of the development is also of a concern. The proposal to build twenty houses in comparison to the other preferred sites is of a very high density and would therefore impact negatively on the environment and local residents. The twenty properties would be very small and out of character with the very large properties on Stoney Lane and the traditional detached and semi-detached properties on Brookfield Avenue. Brookfield Avenue is the only adopted road for local residents and the nearby estate residents and heavily used hence the additional traffic would further increase dangers in the avenue and at the junction of the avenue and the A53 Leek Road. Parking is currently an unresolved issue at school times where double yellow lines have done little to prevent parents from both schools dropping off pupils, parking on the pavements, in front of residents drives or turning around in the avenue or at the junction itself. A new estate half way up the avenue would quickly become a new dropping off point, parking and turning around area. A small brook borders the edge of the site and any development would impact on drainage which can currently be overwhelmed in heavy rain.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding
PO847	Mr Paul Bradbury				EN128	Object	We are concerned about increased flood risk posed by adding 20 properties to an already over-stretched water disposal system. As you will be aware the locality has combined storm and waste water disposal which is already under severe pressure during heavy rainfall. Over the last 25 years we have witnessed incidents when the drains are unable to cope resulting in flooding along the main road. It cannot make good sense to add extra load onto a system which is already struggling to cope. Additional housing must not be considered until after existing capacity issues have been proven to be successfully resolved. At the recent drop in session we enquired about Severn Trent development plans for the area, We were assured by SMDC that questions had been asked but ST had not yet responded. Assuming ST make no significant changes and given that the council is aware of the current and future flood risk, would SMDC be prepared to accept liability if our home is flooded following the introduction of new housing.	See response to PO4469 regarding flooding
PO3858	Mr Spencer Hodgetts				EN128	Object	We are now writing to confirm our objections to the above which were listed on our letter of the 10 th September last in the hope	See response to PO254

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO3881 PO3880	Mr Clive Cartlidge Mr & Mrs P and J Salmon						that we are not wasting our own time and opinions with regard its development as forgone conclusion. The near residents and likeminded Endon residents can now only hope that, following thorough site inspection and site inspection of the properties Stoney Lane and Brookfield Avenue and view the lane itself, it will be realised by responsible counsellors and planning Officers alike how important it is to preserve the character of this last unique area of Endon for amenity it is and not build over it because the space is there to fill.	
PO3878	Mr Clive Cartlidge				EN128	Object	We are told that a certain number of houses are required to be built in Endon and we understand that several small pockets of land spread all around the village have been identified. Small sites more suitable for start homes would be less intrusive and cause less ill feeling and traffic problems. As it is, we, who live here, can rely on Councillors and planners to treat our area as would treat their own.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO148 regarding infill sites
PO1398	Mr A Dean				EN128	Object	We like many of our local residents are totally opposed to this development. It is going to increase the traffic problems of cars which is already a nightmare at peak periods during the school run – leaving hours cars are parked in Brookfield Avenue a lot part of Hazelwood Rd every day, blocking a part of section of the road) Not only is it madness to increase the problem but it will further urbanise the area that people pay high rates + house prices to retain the semi-rural aspects of Endon. I think it is the duty of the Council and its officers to serve the residents well. Knowing the majority is totally opposed to it	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO254 regarding village character and design
PO3907	Mrs H Hatcher				EN128	Object	We object to the plans for Hillswood Drive for the same reasons of access problems and noise plus scale of the development (with no plans to enhance amenities of infrastructure). Also we are concerned about the type of development planned for the canal side sites – being a safe and secure, beautiful setting it would be at the risk of crime and disturbance should travellers or social housing be given approval. We have just had our property valued, should any development diminish the financial investment we have made we will take all this up with the council directly.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways • See response to PO254 regarding design and residential amenity • See response to PO3872 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO148 regarding property value
PO3886	Mr and Mrs G Ruddle				EN128	Object	We reject this site as a possible building land to be included in the SMDC local plan and that it should remain as Private Visual Open Space as the previous plan. The visual open space makes a contribution to the open and semi-rural character of the neighbourhood and should be retained. There is no suitable access for proposed type of the development. Brookfield Avenue has a problem of school traffic with 2 schools adjoining which causes chaos at school time. The open space is important for wildlife, birds, etc. Both existing schools are currently oversubscribed. Flooding is a major problem in Endon in low lying areas caused by our lack of work to water courses and streams.	• See response to PO4469 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO254 regarding open space, village character and wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1959	Mr and Mrs A & M Payne				EN128	Object	With regard to the proposed development of Dollis Field has the council taken into account the following problems which will be caused by this proposed development:- 1: At this moment in time the only access to Dollis Field is via Stoney Lane which is hardly suitable for the vehicles of residents who use it at present as this is only presumably what was originally a country lane. It is assumed therefore that houses on Brookfield Avenue will have to be demolished to allow an entrance to be made to the new houses and again the width of Brookfield Avenue is unsuitable for yet more vehicles due to the school traffic twice a day. You will probably say yes but there are single and double yellow lines the length of the road – these however are completely ignored by the school traffic and sometimes it can be quite dangerous driving up and down Brookfield Avenue as not only do you have to weave in and out of the parked vehicles but also have to keep an eye on the children who walk in groups across the pavement and sometimes spill out onto the road. 2: The other danger of additional vehicles on Brookfield Avenue is at the bottom with its junction with the A53 which as you will know is an extremely busy road and on some occasions there have been near misses due to congestion with vehicles attempting to enter and leave Brookfield Avenue. 3. Therefore it is very apparent that Brookfield Avenue cannot cope with any additional vehicles entering or leaving as one day there could be a serious accident. 4. The problems are compounded as this is also a route in and out for vehicles from Hazelwood Road and the roads leading off it as most people do not use Basnetts Wood at the other end as this road is unadopted and full of enormous holes. I trust you will take these points into account when making your decision.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways
PO1294	Mr Joseph Johnson				EN128		Traffic congestion at the a53 with Brookfield avenue why add to the present traffic congestion when there is 2 possible alternate sites. EN012 and the 2 on Highview Road Endon	- See response to PO4469 regarding highways - See response to PO1075 regarding alternative sites
PO424	Mr & Mrs J. A. & C Hamnett	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	EN128	Support	STONEY LANE, ENDON – SITE EN128 My clients who are the owners of Site EN128, welcome and support the inclusion of the site in the preferred draft allocation s for inclusion in the Local Plan. The site is located within the built-up area and the existing development boundary of the village and is the only site, of the three proposed, which is within the built-up area of the village and does not require removal from the Green Belt. The site is well located within the village and would be a good site for affordable as well as open market dwellings. There are three possible accesses – from both ends of Stoney Lane which is an un-adopted road and via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue onto Brookfield Avenue. The latter property (a semi-detached house), which is owned by my client, could be demolished, if required, to provide a third access. The 2015 SHLAA Site Assessment form identified that the site has excellent residential potential for up to 27 houses. The SHLAA Site Assessment form scored the site's	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							availability as a “2” and the overall classification as a “B”. This was because ownership details had not been submitted. The ownership details and the fact that the site could be immediately available for development were sent to the Council as part of the Site Options consultation in 2015. I can re-confirm that the site is in single ownership and is available for immediate development. The Sustainability Appraisal in the Council’s “Options Assessment” considers that the proposed development of the site would have a positive effect as could the site’s proximity to services and facilities. The Council commissioned Ecological Survey concluded that the site has a fairly low biodiversity value overall although there is a tree with bat roosting potential and a species rich hedgerow. At this stage the client believes that the best way to develop the site is build three distinct cells/clusters of houses each with its own separate access – one cell accessed from Brookfields Avenue; one from the western end of Stoney Lane; and the other from the eastern end of Stoney Lane. However, the final design would depend on discussions with the Council and Highways. The site was previously identified in the former Local Plan as an important visual open space. This policy no longer applies and the site is no longer designated as such. In the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessments carried out in support of the Core Strategy the recommendation is that the site is not (my underline) suitable as Visual Open Space and that the site appears to be suitable for sympathetic development. Development on the site would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape character and would not be particularly visible. There is a Tree Preservation Order on the site however I am told that one of the two trees in question has been felled (relevant permission obtained) as it was badly diseased and dangerous and, that the other is in a poor condition.. Economically the development of the site will support the existing services in the village and, if required, would help improve services and facilities. Socially, development would help ease the shortage of housing land supply in the District and village and could provide much need needed affordable housing. Environmentally, development of this site lessens the pressure on the Green Belt.	
PO264	mr anthony williamson				EN128	Object	I am to strongly object about the building of houses in Endon, especially the proposed development off Stoney Lane. I live in Hazelwood Road and the Brookfield Avenue is already congested in the mornings and late afternoons with parents dropping their children off at the two nearby schools. Extra houses would equate to extra cars and even more congestion.	See response to PO4469 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO4495	Mr Gez Willard				Object	Close examination of the village boundary shows the revised settlement boundary at Clay Lake Road. This is inconsistent with the Green Belt overlay in this area. This is clearly a drafting error or a presentational matter and the Green Belt shading ought to be adjusted in this area so as to consistent with the village infill boundary. [Refer to image at Appendix A of letter document attached to Question 1 response].	Comments noted
PO1947	Mrs Judith Bridgett				Object	The plot EN 024 is a 'soak away' for much of the surrounding land. Gardens in the adjacent Greenmeadow Grove suffer badly from flooding and should development occur on EN024 then not only would any new developments more than likely flood, but there would be increased flooding in Greenmeadow Grove and the surrounding residential dwellings. Should development occur on EN024 then this would add to the congestion on the A53 through Endon with the additional entrance onto the main road from the new development. With many side roads joining the main road so close to Endon High School (Platts Avenue, Kent Drive, Brookfield Avenue.) then the risk to pedestrians would increase. There is no other access onto the field. The public footpath through EN024 is used by the public for recreational use -dog walking, enjoyment of nature, running, cycling. The field is used for farming for part of the year. The area is designated Green Belt land according to the district plan of 28 April 2016. This is a good decision and welcomed by the local residents. The plot EN024 is not within the parish of Endon's boundaries, according to the district plan, and so building on this would not count to the development number of houses required in the parish.	EN024 is not a proposed site in the Preferred Options 2016 consultation
PO4845	Mrs M Bates				Object	I am concerned about the extra volume of people and car which will result in the rural community of Endon which in my opinion will be spoilt. The schools the Dr's and surgeries will not be able to cope and the access roads to be able to cope to the planned areas will be more congested than they are now. All these leading onto the A53 which is now congested. Why these houses can't be built in towns e.g. the dilapidated Doultons site Burslem. Ps I have seen Endon Parish Council's alternative sites, and these seem much better and much more sensible.	- New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites need to be included. Any new development taking place will be subject to design

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
							policies contained within the new Local Plan The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan.
PO979 PO986	Mrs Hayley Sullivan Mr Michael Sullivan				Object	Other Comments Regarding Rural Areas Flooding and Drainage / Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update (SFRA) (2015) My main concern and reason for lodging a formal objection to building on site EN012 (and most likely extending over time to EN007, EN019 and EN101 therefore providing 131 properties), relates to drainage and sewerage. It is clear that no formal survey has been undertaken prior to confirming site EN012 as a preferred site – as if a comprehensive survey had been completed it is highly likely that the characteristics of the land would have raised concerns about putting this site forward as a preferred site – as follows: - The area is described as being 'flat and rough' when in fact, apart from a narrow strip to the top left side of the main field, the area slopes in three directions forming a 'bowl' with up to 1 in 3 gradients. - There are two active land drains situated lower centre of the main field which protrude out of the ground. The lower drain runs into a trough supplying cattle drinking water. During rainy conditions, both drains feed excess water down to the bottom of the field and into a private culvert. - The culvert is known to flood in adverse weather conditions affecting several properties adjacent to the culvert. - The sub-soil in this area is clay with a high elasticity level (sourced from a private survey at 18 Houston Avenue in 1997). The property rebuild required the use of piles because of land slip. - Any roads or properties build on EN012 together with any major movement of earth and clay will without doubt cause an increase of water into the culvert. To cope with this situation the culvert will have to be rebuilt. This is a private culvert which passes under 18 Houston Avenue, under Houston Avenue and then on through the estate down to the main road. Many properties will be affected by this. - Many of the properties built in this area were built using red ash as infill under concrete flooring as there was little information available regarding the proper selection of materials at that time. It is widely accepted that red ash contains sulphate which reacts badly when exposed to damp and in contact with concrete. I have fairly limited knowledge of this area but would appreciate assurance that a site survey to assess the likelihood of increased flood damage includes an assessment of the impact on local properties with red ash. My property is situated on land at a lower level to the proposed sites. I have lived in this property for approximately 12 years and the property has already been severely flooded on two occasions during heavy rain storms. I have photographic evidence and insurance claims to evidence this. The flooding has been caused by the land / current culvert being unable to cope with the amount of excess water and this situation will be made significantly worse should the sites be developed. Any development of the area will result in more concreted and tarmac areas and prevent excess water from being naturally absorbed. I understand that many other neighbours have experienced similar problems and Leek Road is often also flooded, as a result, there is	- The Council consults the Environment Agency and SCC regarding flooding and is informed by their comments. Potential flood risk issues, will require flood risk assessment/modelling and early engagement with County Council & Environment Agency - Sites EN007/EN019/EN101 are not proposed sites in the Preferred Options 2016 consultation - See response to PO4845 - New housing schemes depending on their size will need to incorporate areas of open space and landscaping, and also maintain existing pedestrian links as well as the consideration of new links in line with Local Plan policy. - Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						a need for a comprehensive strategic flood risk assessment to be completed to assess the risk for the whole area before being assessed as a potential site for future development. Furthermore if this site is to go ahead, there is the need for assurance from SMDC as to who will be responsible for damage to properties should flooding incidents worsen. Is this the developer or SMDC or Severn Trent Water (who appear to be named in the Council's plans regarding having a duty to complete improvements to sewers etc.)? Other current objections There are a number of other objections already lodged with SMDC as part of the previous consultation process which have not been addressed: - No consideration has been given as to how local infrastructure would support a development of this scale - Recreational and Other Open Space : Regular communications from local MPs of all parties have referred to cases of antisocial behaviour and the need for more and improved open spaces and recreational areas for children and youths in the area. Such communications have indicated that there is already limited space available. The park area adjacent to proposed site EN012 would be fully enclosed by this housing development and when the other sites proceed, will be unable to respond to the demand from a further 131 properties. As such, any proposal to build so many properties in a village area should be accompanied by a proposal to extend the current recreational and open space available to the local residents. - Access to Schools : I am Chair of Governors at Endon Hall Primary School and as such have a good level of understanding regarding availability of school places at all three local primary schools (Endon Hall Primary, St Luke's Primary and St Anne's Primary). All three primary schools have a PAN of 30 children per school year and are either full, or oversubscribed for each intake period. At Endon Hall Primary School we have been operating above PAN in nearly every year group due to the current demand for places and this has reached a position where it is no longer viable to continue to accept such high pupil numbers. As a result, the School made a strategic decision during 2014/15 to close to any new admissions and to proactively manage pupil numbers to a level closer to the PAN. This decision was made to enable the teaching staff to be able to support all children to meet their expected levels of progress and to operate in a space conducive to learning. Current classroom sizes and public spaces prevent any further increase in pupil numbers. Endon Hall is situated on land surrounded on all sides by residential properties, is unable to expand. I understand that the situation is similar for the other primary schools. An increase in housing and in particular, starter homes, would naturally result in an increase in demand for primary school places which are not available. - Access during Development Process and Post Development Process : It would appear that the only access to the proposed site is via established and fully occupied housing estates. The housing estates have relatively narrow roads, many of which are in need of repair at the present time. A phased site approach could result in building work taking place over a three to five year period. Contractors' vehicles and all traffic associated with a development of this size will have a dramatic impact on local residents and village life. Once complete and all properties occupied, the developments will result in circa 260 additional vehicles (based on two cars per property) using the small roads	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						and lanes, access to Leek Road will be congested and the likelihood of road traffic accidents will increase. The roads on the adjoining estates from Endon Hall Primary School to Hillswood Drive will not be able to absorb the increased level of usage.	
PO1950	Mr Frank Poole				Object	EN007 I am very concerned that any additional building in the Endon area will add to a flooding problem, which is already significant. The Staffordshire Moorlands Authority is already aware of this problem as detailed in your Level 1 SFRA report dated October 2015. Section 4.6.1 states : "18 records (of floods) between 1997 and 2012 are shown in Endon along Leek Road, of which 8 incidents occurred in 2012". I am aware of past flooding difficulties on the High View Estate, which can only be increased if the planned development takes place on sections EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101. I was present at a Parish Council meeting when the flooding on the High View were discussed with Staffordshire Moorlands representatives and to my knowledge these problems have not been resolved. The Endon Village has particular problems, being situated at the lowest point in the area, which is dissected by a brook, prone to overflowing its banks. In my view any development in Endon, without major investment to improve the main drains, will have an adverse affect on the Village. Inadequate drainage systems leads to flooding on Leek Road adjacent to Endon High School, this problem is increased because of significant water run off from the high ground at the Stoney Lane end of Brookfield Road. At times the volume of water is such that stones and other debris are swept along Brookfield, adding to poor drainage. I am concerned that additional building on section EN126 will significantly increase the current serious problems, because of additional dirty water entering the drains from new properties and surface water run off from an area, that currently acts as a soakaway. I also believe that additional water would be deposited on the Endon St Lukes School playing field, rendering it useless for a significant portion of the year. It is clear that the drainage system in Endon is inadequate and additional building will increase the current serious problems. In March 2014 Nick Boles , Minister for Local Planning, stated in Parliament - "We are issuing robust guidelines on flood risk, making it crystal clear that councils need to consider strict tests set out in national policy and where they are not met new developments should not be allowed." I trust that appropriate members and officials of the Local Authority will accept responsibility should their decisions have an adverse affect on properties in the area, and in particular my own property.	See response to PO979

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO1785 PO1903PO1868 PO1781 PO1934 PO1812PO1880 PO1860PO1930 PO1816PO1815 PO1790 PO1791 PO1878 PO1932 PO1795 PO1896 PO1928 PO1807 PO1811PO1940 PO1802PO1890 PO1800PO1911 PO1810 PO1902PO1898 PO1786PO1782 PO1809 PO1920 PO8998 PO9491 PO1796 PO1887PO1919 PO1799PO1801 PO1869 PO1908 PO1804PO1893 PO1886PO1797 PO1779 PO178 PO9436 PO9487PO9500 PO9475 PO9440 PO9479 PO9461 PO9454PO9508 PO9495	Mrs Christine Bruce Mr Peter Walker Mr Peter Beresford Mrs Beryl Beresford Mr George Machin Mr Brian Mills Mrs Josephine Mills Mrs Bev Ashley Mr Andrew Birchenhall Mr J.T. Flannigan Mrs Betty Flannigan Mr Andrew Walley Mrs Valerie Walley Mrs Vivian Machin Ms Anthea Marilyn Price Mr Martin Underwood Ms Claire Underwood Mrs Hilary M Wilcox Mr Philip N Wilcox Mr E J Wetherhill Mrs F E Wetherhill Mr K Bate Mrs Julie Bate Mr Lilton Biswas Mrs Natalie Biswas Mrs Tracy Roberts Mr Philip Bruce Dr Simon Evans Ms Joanne Bruce Mr David Bruce Mr Daniel				Object	The initial site assessment of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contains several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a '@flat overgrown field' this is clearly not the case as the filed slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is 1 of the highest points in the village. It was stated that there are semi-rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from this field to the Roaches and Cheshire according to the green belt review 4 fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN108, areas which have been taken out any proposed site development are also classed as grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that En012, EN007, EN019, and EN101 fields act as a soakaway. The lane running from Endon bank farm is watershed for the estate. There are 3 culverts leading from EN101, EN019, and EN007. At present these culverts drain in to pipes 9" diameter which then runs under the estate. The field's drains are connected to storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today. We know that 1 of these culverts in EN007 resulted in 1 property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on the fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision-making process regarding these sites. A major concern for all the families living on the estate is safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon primary school. The roads on the estate are only 4.83mtrs wide, barley enough for 2 cars to pass, especially on the corner. The estate is the major catchment area for the schools and other Endon Schools many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents have to travel further afield park on the footpaths with an obvious danger to the children and residents. The junction with the A53, hillside Avenue and church lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey as this school to behind the plough car park walk down church lane. At peak times this was 1 car every 10 seconds. Parents encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough Car Park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpaths in church lane in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath and the school traffic warden has had to help children and parents to cross both church lane and the A53. With a potential 131 more houses built on the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there has already been a traffic warden injured within the last 12mths. As residents of high view estate we are very disappointed that the 4 identified remain either green belt or amber. We note that all the site sin bagnall, Stockton brook, or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the parish council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation process. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These 3 sites are all classed as grade 4 and houses were built,	- Comments noted - The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. These included sites EN101/EN019/EN007 which were assessed as amber - See response to PO4845 - Sites EN108/EN092 were assessed as C on the SHLAA and were not considered appropriate for development - EN030 is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
	Roberts Mr Andrew McCann Mr Charles Bennett Mr Paul Matthews Mrs L Ball Mr Scott Taylor Mr Terence Bate Mrs Eileen Bate Mr Michael Moore mrs carolyn moore Mrs Wendy Taylor Mr Neil Taylor Mr J Pointon Mr N Roberts Mr C Ball Mr Howard Kelsall Mr Peter Walker Ms Yvonne St. Cyr Mrs Kim Bennett Mrs Sandra Broad Ms Katherine McCann Mr Thomas Bennett Mr Karl Mansfield Mr John Overend Mr Howard Broad Mr Stanley Hurst Mr Paul McCann					within what is classed as the old village. Since the high view estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village and the newer part of the village. Any development to these would impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary as infill. Current dwellings at the top of high view estate are below the skyline. Any further developments will result in skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. It appears that the SMDC will allow urban development will allow urban development to take place in green field sites towards brown edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007, are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle and brown long eared bats. The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with the bat potential, in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and dry ditch that could be support the reptile populations warrant the site being attributed regional ecological importance (Staffordshire ecological records SER/15/427 – aug 2015) Pls note that all my previous objections are still applicable	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO1944 PO9444	Mrs Jane Ailsa Rennie MR ANDREW RENNIE				Object	EN101 Infrastructure Schools- I am not sure how many children outside the Endon Schools catchment areas attend each of the three schools so I am not in a position to comment on their capacity or ability to take additional children from within the area. Infrastructure Traffic & Transport & Carbon Footprint. I have recently taken part in a traffic survey (the results of which are held by Parish Councillor Joe Porter) at the junction of the A53 Leek Road , Station Road Endon , the B5051 to and from Brown Edge and Hillswood Drive Endon. From the results of the survey it is clear that the junction which feeds three roads onto the A53 is not capable of handling any additional vehicles from the proposed development EN101. Traffic using the junction from Station Road entrance often goes straight across the junction towards Brown Edge which leads to a build up of vehicles because vehicles have to cross both lanes of traffic. If the proposed development site EN101 were to be approved as a suitable site it would make the A53 junction unfit for purpose and pose a health and safety hazard from the dangers of traffic, noise and air pollution to not just the local dwellings but also to the children who walk this way to school each day. Any proposed development on site EN101 would increase the vehicle volumes by at least twice the number of proposed dwellings on the site because the occupiers would have to travel at least ten miles per day either south to Stoke-On-Trent or north to Leek and the Moorlands to find suitable employment which was capable of servicing debt finance on the property. Quality employment paying reasonable salaries to service debt finance to purchase homes within the Stoke-On-Trent / Leek area is very difficult to find so occupiers of the properties will have to travel larger distances thereby increasing the carbon footprint of the Endon area and damaging the environment. Surely the longer term view should be to locate more homes closer to where the employment is rather than spreading it far and wide? Infrastructure Other: At present Endon has one village shop/ store with another being built on the A53 which was formerly a car garage, one petrol filling station with a snack shop, one chemist shop, one doctors surgery, one hairdressers, two public houses with eating facilities and one hearing aid centre and a crèche for young children two churches and one village hall. I understand the Doctors Surgery is registered to its full capacity and unable to take additional patients to its register. The parking facilities at the village stores are limited and the size of the shop and range of products is limited. No doubt the Coop store being built will address the parking and limitations of the village store but this will add even more strain to the A53 junction I eluded to in the first paragraph because more local people will drive to the Coop store rather than walking to the village store added to which the entrance and exit to this store will be extremely dangerous during school closing times. The location of Site EN101 is unsuitable because it is situated at the top of hill which means occupiers will inevitably resort to vehicular transport because of the steepness of the hill. It is unfriendly to disabled users and people with breathing difficulties. Because of the proposed proximity of the site it is often exposed to the worst of the inclement weather on the prevailing westerly winds being at the top of the hill. During the winter months when snow is lying for days and weeks people are unable to get to the top of High View Road by vehicle because the	EN101 is not a proposed site in the Preferred Options 2016 consultation

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						road and pavements are not on the core gritting routes this can lead to emergency services not being able to access residents. Any development on the proposed site EN 101 would add to these current problems. Also I don't think the drain infrastructure in the Endon area will be able to cope with any increased demand from a proposed development. Landscape- The Landscape on the proposed development site EN 101 is a sloping field on a gradient running down from Endon Bank Farm towards Hillswood Drive Playing Field. These fields including the trees which surround them act as sponge reducing the run off of surface water to the lower levels of Endon. The views from site EN101 are rural looking over towards Rushton and Macclesfield in one direction and over to Lask Edge in the south westerly direction. These views are beautiful and uninterrupted, but equally are the views if you walk up Holehouse Lane and look back towards Endon where at present you can barely see the top of any properties in High View Road from any point as you walk up Holehouse Lane. If a proposed development were to go ahead on site EN 101 it would break the vista not just from Endon looking outwards but also from the immediate countryside looking inwards towards Endon. Surely we should be looking to protect this site for future dairy farming which will help secure local employment and reduce our carbon footprint? Nature Conservation - The proposed site EN101 would have serious implications for the local wildlife. The site has trees which are of the old British hardwood types and are used by the following birds: Perrigin Falcons, Kestrels, Buzzard, Sparrow Hawk, Owls, Woodpeckers and Lapwing on the soaked parts of the field during early spring. The birds of prey are attracted by the food supply of field mice, voles, weasels and other mammals which use the site, foxes, and badgers are also attracted by the pheasants which frequent the field. Flood Risk- Endon has a long history of flooding and its associated problems. As I mentioned in the landscape paragraph Site EN101 acts as a natural sponge relieving the run off of surface water from the upper levels. EN 101 is at the top of four proposed development sites which could be enhanced with further trees to reduce surface water run off. If any proposed development took place on site EN101 then further consequences would be felt at lower levels because not matter what additional drains are put in the water has to run down bank somewhere causing more problems for people living lower down the estate and adjacent to the main road. You only have to look at the amount of times the A53 is being dug up from the Station Road junction to past Endon School to realise there are problems underground and these are a consequence of ground movement caused by flooding and drainage issues. If you look in the history books of the local area Endon is always featured in the flood articles. If you walk from site EN101 to EN 012 in the middle of winter after snow has just melted you will witness how much of a sponge site EN 101 actually is. The existing drainage system would not be capable of handling any resulting additional capacity. Amenity: Site EN101 would involve loss of light and privacy to the homes on High View Road but there are wider implications for the whole estate because the noise from increased traffic and people accessing the dwellings through the estate by vehicle would increase, and cause damage to air quality and noise levels on a permanent basis. In addition to the adult	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						amenities there are also children amenities with the site EN101 as it exists because although it is private farmland local children use these fields as part of their habitat even though they maybe trespassing for such activities as sledging hide & seek and getting conkers in the autumn. Losing such an amenity would be damaging to the young children who can wander in a safe environment where there are no roads! Scale of Development: Any kind of development if it is absolutely necessary should be of a limited nature with low height buildings restricted to one level with a height restriction thus minimising any impact on the existing dwellings in High View Road and having minimum impact on the vista. Any large scale development would cripple the existing highway network system, deteriorate health and safety with noise and pollution and could not be handled by the local infrastructure as it stands. Government Policy: There is a government policy to build more housing to meet expected future demand. The demand for housing in the Endon area will be determined by sustainable employment opportunities within the local area. The local area in this context is Leek and Stoke for a reasonable long term employment period. These two area's are still going through a slow re-building process before quality sustainable employment opportunities become available. You have to get the employment in place first and then address the housing needs. The former is only in it's infancy as evidenced by the number of long term unsold existing properties on the estate adjacent to site EN101. The addition of further properties at the site EN101 would only exasperate the problem further which is what happened on a similar site on the edge of Shaftsbury Wiltshire where the cheap affordable housing was sold and taken up by people who did not care about the local people and area (with increased crime) and the dwellings which were built similar to the estate were left empty and could not be sold because there were no local quality employment opportunities. If affordable Social Housing needs to be built it should built closer to the existing employment opportunities Stoke & Leek thus minimising carbon footprint and focussing population growth closer to the amenities and infrastructure. The Government policy is to encroach onto greenbelt land only when absolutely necessary however just because a particular greenbelt site is beyond a village signpost does not mean that site is not less suitable than a site within a village boundary. A more suitable site which adjoins the A 53 just beyond the village sign post has been removed from the proposed site allocations because it did not come within the village boundary and was adjacent to a flood risk area. This site should be reviewed again because it is on flat land and is directly accessible from the A53 making vehicular access safer with less impact on the traffic junction I surveyed. Immediately opposite this site is a horticultural nursery with Polly tunnels so it is difficult to see how developing the other site would extend the village boundary when the nursery already exists. Other: Because of the slow employment rebuilding process in the Stoke & Leek area's many younger generations have left the Endon area to seek quality employment elsewhere. Endon is therefore becoming an elderly community which has specific housing needs. Building housing on Site EN 101 at the top of an existing housing estate is not the solution. If affordable social housing needs to built it needs to be built away from site EN101 possibly opposite the poly tunnels	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						site beyond the Endon village sign, which means the Endon village sign could be moved a few hundred yards to bring the site into the village along with the Nursery! Existing brownfields sites should be considered such as the disused railway running beyond Endon Station through to Stockton Brook this will never be brought back into use because the track and infrastructure between Endon and Stoke-on-Trent is in such a state beyond repair that it will never be used again. This land should be acquired from Network Rail and Moorland Railways and used for residential development in the Endon area.	
PO1945	Mrs Jane Ailsa Rennie				Object	In addition to these original objections I would also like to add that any further development in and around the existing Endon estate will cause Air Pollution issues because of the static traffic waiting to leave the estate. I think the empty field at Hallswater which links the old and new village would be a more suitable site to develop with access directly onto the A53.	• If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO9444	MR ANDREW RENNIE				Object	Further email comments: I understand one of the sites listed above EN012 has been designated a green status (draft potential allocations) and the other sites EN007, EN019 & EN101 have been designated amber (draft reserve sites) for the time being. It would be helpful to know why the only Draft Reserve Sites (Amber) are the only sites in the Endon area which have been designated this status when no other sites have been given this designation. I wish to continue to object regarding allocating any of these sites for development for the reasons outlined in the attached original consultation documents but additionally from the Infrastructure Highways point of view. Both the road way and road footpath's on and surrounding the existing estate are not capable of taking any further increase in traffic. Today 6th June 2016 was the first day back from half term holidays and I gave my wife a lift to work to Hanley and it took me five minutes to get a clear slot to leave Hillside Avenue and join the main A53 Leek Road at 7:20 AM this morning. If any major scale development took place at the top of the existing estate the whole junction would become grid locked and that is in fair weather conditions. The highways infrastructure is not fit for purpose which combined with the flooding issues on the existing estate should be the main reasons why the above sites should be removed from the local plan altogether. In addition I understand a site adjacent to Hallwater which would link both the old village to	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan.
PO9466	Mr John Proffitt				General comment	Email submitted 03/06/16: I am making contact to offer my support for the proposed Alternative option for the future housing projects in Endon Village. The alternative option looks far more balanced [than EN012]... this part of Endon is much less congested with fewer houses less traffic and much better access to the main A53.	Comments noted
PO9499	Mr Paul Stevens				Object	Email submitted objecting to sites EN007/EN019/EN101: First of all I would like to state that I'm in favour of the alternative plans that are about to be submitted by the Endon with Stanley Parish council. I find the Staffordshire Moorlands plans ludicrous for the following reasons; The four fields on our estate (EN012, EN007, EN019 & EN101) are all Green Belt area's - question doesn't this mean anything anymore and if not why was it granted in the first place. I appreciate that only site EN012 has been given approval so far but question what's to stop the remaining 3 "Amber" fields from being granted the same permission. We currently have severe issues with drains and garden flooding (Extenuated over the last couple of years). So, with the possibility of an extra 131 houses question what's going to be done to solve this ever increasing problem. Thirdly, what's going to be done about the substantial increase in traffic. The junction at the bottom of Hillswood Drive is an accident waiting to happen. Cars are left at the bottom of Hillswood Drive within metres of the junction resulting in reduced width of the road. Turning left is treacherous (With the pedestrian crossing approximately 10 metres to the left of the junction) and turning right at busy times is near on impossible!!!! Finally, I'm lead to believe that a third of these will be Social or Affordable housing. Surely this will lead to a drastic reduction in the values of property within the area and significant negative changes to the wonderful village life we currently enjoy and pay for the privilege of. A very concerned and disappointed resident.	See responses above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO252	Mr and Mrs A.J. Eardley				Object	With specific regard to site EN128..... if these areas are classed as rural areas ... or even semi rural areas.... it is imperative to maintain the visual open spaces within the village or Endon will just become a suburb of Stoke. The health of the children at St Luke's Primary School is already compromised by the proximity of the main road, with the ever increasing volume of traffic, and to be hemmed in on both sides would only exacerbate things. A more even distribution of more sites, each with fewer dwellings, would have less of an impact on the current infrastructure and nature of Endon.	See response to question 37 regarding this site
PO994	Mr Oliver Sullivan				Object	Other Comments Regarding Rural Areas Flooding and Drainage / Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update (SFRA) (2015) My main concern and reason for lodging a formal objection to building on site EN012 (and most likely extending over time to EN007, EN019 and EN101 therefore providing 131 properties), relates to drainage and sewerage. It is clear that no formal survey has been undertaken prior to confirming site EN012 as a preferred site – as if a comprehensive survey had been completed it is highly likely that the characteristics of the land would have raised concerns about putting this site forward as a preferred site – as follows: - The area is described as being 'flat and rough' when in fact, apart from a narrow strip to the top left side of the main field, the area slopes in three directions forming a 'bowl' with up to 1 in 3 gradients. - There are two active land drains situated lower centre of the main field which protrude out of the ground. The lower drain runs into a trough supplying cattle drinking water. During rainy conditions, both drains feed excess water down to the bottom of the field and into a private culvert. - The culvert is known to flood in adverse weather conditions affecting several properties adjacent to the culvert. - The sub-soil in this area is clay with a high elasticity level (sourced from a private survey at 18 Houston Avenue in 1997). The property rebuild required the use of piles because of land slip. - Any roads or properties build on EN012 together with any major movement of earth and clay will without doubt cause an increase of water into the culvert. To cope with this situation the culvert will have to be rebuilt. This is a private culvert which passes under 18 Houston Avenue, under Houston Avenue and then on through the estate down to the main road. Many properties will be affected by this. - Many of the properties built in this area were built using red ash as infill under concrete flooring as there was little information available regarding the proper selection of materials at that time. It is widely accepted that red ash contains sulphate which reacts badly when exposed to damp and in contact with concrete. I have fairly limited knowledge of this area but would appreciate assurance that a site survey to assess the likelihood of increased flood damage includes an assessment of the impact on local properties with red ash. My property is situated on land at a lower level to the proposed sites. I have lived in this property for approximately 12 years and the property has already been severely flooded on two occasions during heavy rain storms. I have photographic evidence and insurance claims to evidence this. The flooding has been caused by the land / current culvert being unable to cope with the amount of excess water and this situation will be made significantly worse should the sites be developed. Any development of the area will result in more concreted and tarmac areas and prevent	See response to PO979

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						excess water from being naturally absorbed. I understand that many other neighbours have experienced similar problems and Leek Road is often also flooded, as a result, there is a need for a comprehensive strategic flood risk assessment to be completed to assess the risk for the whole area before being assessed as a potential site for future development. Furthermore if this site is to go ahead, there is the need for assurance from SMDC as to who will be responsible for damage to properties should flooding incidents worsen. Is this the developer or SMDC or Severn Trent Water (who appear to be named in the Council's plans regarding having a duty to complete improvements to sewers etc.)? Other current objections There are a number of other objections already lodged with SMDC as part of the previous consultation process which have not been addressed: - No consideration has been given as to how local infrastructure would support a development of this scale - Recreational and Other Open Space : Regular communications from local MPs of all parties have referred to cases of antisocial behaviour and the need for more and improved open spaces and recreational areas for children and youths in the area. Such communications have indicated that there is already limited space available. The park area adjacent to proposed site EN012 would be fully enclosed by this housing development and when the other sites proceed, will be unable to respond to the demand from a further 131 properties. As such, any proposal to build so many properties in a village area should be accompanied by a proposal to extend the current recreational and open space available to the local residents. - Access to Schools: All three primary schools have a PAN of 30 children per school year and are either full, or oversubscribed for each intake period. An increase in housing and in particular, starter homes, would naturally result in an increase in demand for primary school places which are not available. Access during Development Process and Post Development Process : It would appear that the only access to the proposed site is via established and fully occupied housing estates. The housing estates have relatively narrow roads, many of which are in need of repair at the present time. A phased site approach could result in building work taking place over a three to five year period. Contractors' vehicles and all traffic associated with a development of this size will have a dramatic impact on local residents and village life. Once complete and all properties occupied, the developments will result in circa 260 additional vehicles (based on two cars per property) using the small roads and lanes, access to Leek Road will be congested and the likelihood of road traffic accidents will increase. The roads on the adjoining estates from Endon Hall Primary School to Hillswood Drive will not be able to absorb the increased level of usage.	
PO9002 PO9003	Mrs Hayley Mansfield				Object	Ref EN007 The initial site assessments of the fields EN101, EN019, EN007 and EN012 contained several inaccuracies. For example EN101 was described as a 'flat overgrown field.' This is clearly not the case as the field slopes from Endon Bank Farm which is one of the highest points in the village .It was stated that there are semi rural views from the fields. In fact there are undisturbed views from the fields to the Roaches, and Cheshire. According to the Green Belt Review all four fields are classed as Grade 4 (poor agricultural land). Interestingly EN092 and EN 108,	See comments above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						areas which have been taken out of any proposed development are also classed as Grade 4. The description also stated no flooding issues. Endon is renowned for flooding. The recently formed Flood Forum has established that there are 18 tributaries to the main Endon Brook and 54 properties within the village boundary which have been subject to flooding. We know that EN012, EN007, EN019 and EN101 fields act as 'soak away.' The lane running from Endon Bank Farm is the watershed for the estate. There are three culverts leading from EN101, EN019 and EN007. At present these culverts drain into pipes 9" diameter which then run under the estate. The field drains are connected to the storm water house drains. This is a relic from the 1960's planning regulations and would not be allowed today. We know that one of these culverts in EN007 resulted in one property in Houston Avenue having to be completely rebuilt. This can only get worse if building is allowed on these fields and climate change results in more rainfall. These inaccuracies undermine the SMDC decision- making process concerning these sites. A major concern for families living on the estate is the safety for residents, especially children who attend Endon Hall Primary School. The roads on the estate are only 4.83 meters wide, barely enough for two cars to pass, especially on corners. The estate is the major catchment area for the school and other Endon schools and many children walk to school each morning. However the situation outside the school in Hillside Avenue is extremely dangerous. Parents travelling from further afield park on the footpaths with the obvious danger to children and residents. The junction with the A53, Hillside Avenue and Church Lane is extremely hazardous. Residents recently undertook a traffic survey at this junction. At peak times there is one car every 10 seconds. Parents are encouraged by the school to park behind the Plough car park and walk down Church Lane to the junction with Hillside. Incredibly there is no footpath in Church Lane (in fact it is not wide enough to accommodate a footpath) and the school traffic warden has to help children and parents to cross both Church Lane and the main A53. With a potential 131 more houses built in the designated sites, this would have serious consequences and is a serious accident waiting to happen. Indeed there have already been a number of minor accidents at the junction including the traffic warden being injured within the last 12 months. As residents of High View Estate, we are very disappointed that the four identified sites remain either 'green' or 'amber'. We note that all sites in Bagnall, Stockton Brook or Stanley have now been removed from the consultation process with no rationale given. Other areas within the village have been identified by the Parish Council. These are local people with local knowledge and I urge the relevant authorities to seriously consider their options during the consultation period. Previously, many residents proposed EN108, EN092 and EN030. These three sites are all classed as Grade 4 and houses were built, within what is classed as the old village, since the High View Estate was completed. Houses built here would have their own access to the A53, no flooding issues and could be classed as infill as they would connect the old village to the newer part of the village. Any development in these areas would have minimal impact on existing residents. Furthermore it could not be classed as urban sprawl as it does not connect Endon with Longsdon but builds within the village boundary	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
						as infill. Current dwellings at the top of High View Estate are below the skyline. Any further development will result in the skyline being breached and houses would be clearly visible from several directions. SMDC have previously specifically refused planning permission under similar circumstances. It appears that SMDC will allow urban development to take place in Green field sites towards Brown Edge but do not appear keen to allow any kind of development connecting the two main parts of the village. Finally the trees bordering EN101, EN019 and EN007 are the foraging area for protected species of bats such as pipistrelle, and brown long eared bats. 'The large number of ash, oak and sycamore trees with bat potential is deemed to have the highest value, their loss as roosts could adversely affect regional bat populations.' The major aspects of interest are the significant bat roosting potential in the 10 trees, connectivity to other more biodiverse habitats and the dry ditch that could support reptile populations which warrants the site being attributed regional ecological importance. (Staffordshire Ecological Records SER/15/427-Aug 2015) Please bear in mind the current problems with access to Hillswood Drive during icy conditions, due to width, road surface and the fact it is not prioritised in terms of gritting. We have been unable to get to work on a number of occasions. Cars have veered off the road onto pavements when children have been walking home from school. The width of the road is already an issue. We feel that it is beneficial to the health and wellbeing of the village's children that the playing field should adjoin green belt land rather than be surrounded by houses, concrete, tarmac and cars. At the moment, this is a peaceful place for dog walkers, children and parents, walkers enjoying nature and those using the newly installed "Green Gymn". Please note that all my previous objections are still applicable. Thank you for your response.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO31	Miss Gabrielle Bailey				Object	This plan is fundamentally flawed - a massive concentration of land being used for employment, housing and a gypsy area are being proposed without any proposal on how the roads can support the extra people. It's gridlocked in this are frequently already. You can wait for 20 mins at the crossroads to Blythe Bridge. People park all the way down the main road in Blythe Bridge which means queues down the road as it's single file. Add this to waiting for the railway crossing at Blythe Bridge and what should be a short journey turns into one where you need to pack sandwiches! With new sites for housing and a massive area now allocated for building to support employment how on earth are residents supposed to get to work or indeed hope to cross Cheadle Road In Forsbrook village? It's dangerous and time consuming as it is. I haven't seen anything on the table as solutions to the infrastructure problems which need to be in place before or alongside any addition to the population. Additionally why on earth are we using green belt land re's brownfi sites available? Do we liaise with other councils to come up with a holistic strategy?	- National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. - Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites need to be included. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan - The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area.
PO9449	Ms Julie Lyons				Object	BB045 - Housing Site Option I have objected to the plans for land release on Dilhorne Road, Forsbrook, BB045 along with a number of my neighbours. This parcel of land was classed as green belt and then mysteriously re classified as greenfield, as I was informed by one of your team at the Cheadle meeting in 2015. I attended the latest Parish meeting and was informed that the Parish Council had identified unsuitable/suitable land for release on a RAG status, but the plan that had been released from SMDC was different from the one submitted by Parish. The land on Dilhorne Road had now resumed it's original classification as greenbelt and had	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - BB045 is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						been marked as a Red. I attended another meeting on the 6th June and asked the question who had marked the parcel of land as a Red, I was informed that the body that releases greenbelt land had placed the flag. I was also informed that this land had now been removed from the consultation. If this is correct have the other 2 parcels of land on Dilhorne Road with site plans also been removed from any future at risk register. My question surely if this government body? had looked the plans before the initial release then this would have saved a lot of council and residents time, money and much more importantly spared the local community from a great amount of stress and anxiety.	The Green Belt Review Study commissioned by the Council provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Preferred Options 2016 consultation proposed two housing sites in Blythe Bridge BB054 & BB041.
PO8259	Mr Roger Melville				Support	Email dated 09/06/16 and supporting report from agent Rob Duncan dated 10/06/16 submitted [both attached], comparing site BB044 against Preferred Options sites BB014 +BB054, concluding that BB044 is more suitable, and should become a preferred option for Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook.	A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO408	Mr Roger Melville				Support	BB044 Chapel Street. The Green Belt study report confirms that its overall impact on the purposes of the Green Belt will be limited, and scores higher in the report than either of the two preferred options. The report states site BB044 I quote: "Despite there being no significant northern boundary, the site is visually reasonably well enclosed (being set back from the road and having a strong wooded boundary). The northern boundary is weaker but still a reasonably substantial hedgerow/property boundary. Development would be a reasonable rounding-off of the village envelope in this location" In addition since the report planning permission for	See response to PO8259

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						development on the former kennel site on the northern boundary has been granted (SMD/2015/0338) this means that the site will be almost wholly enclosed by residential development on three sides, and Chapel Street on the other, giving effective defensible boundaries on all sides of the site. This cannot be said about either of the two preferred sites Development Capacity Study Housing Site Suitability Ranking Table. BB044 is ranked no 52 across the Moorlands. With Category Rating 2xGreen 2xAmber No Red. Highest ranked site in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge. Even higher than sites that has already been developed. i.e. Smithfield site. The two preferred sites AD011 (BB041) is ranked no 132 and BB054 is not even ranked Highways: BB044 Chapel Street a No Through Road its wider in most parts than both the Preferred Options Roads (Draycott Old Road & Caverswall Old Road) and only serves six dwellings to the north of the site so has very minimal traffic movement at any time of the day. In contrast both the Preferred Options Roads (Draycott Old Road & Caverswall Old Road) are extremely busy and dangerous certainly at peak times Commute and School Runs. Flooding: BB044 has attracted lots of adverse comments with regard to Flooding most of which are completely unfounded. The bottom right hand corner appears to be in the Flood Zone. However an independent flood report was commissioned on this site which was included in Representation to the Site Allocations Consultation last Year. This detailed report covers all aspects of Flooding and impact would not be significant and at worse could be overcome by addition of conditions on any development. Furthermore it would not be the intention to develop the bottom wooded area of the site but included an attractive green space to be enjoyed by the Residents of the Development. Surely this is a	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						better site than either of the two preferred options.	
PO1429	Mrs. J Fowell				Object	TR015 The land is green belt adjacent to the village cemetery. Not suitable for residential so why should it be used for this purpose. The area is close to properties that will suffer a loss of value should this site be prepared. The land is not adjacent to the A50.	This site is not proposed for development
PO8386	Mr David Nixon				Object	Emails and supporting attachments submitted which argue that three fields in Mr Nixon's ownership - namely ADD010(BB079) plus land across Caverswall Old Rd [termed "MG" in the correspondence but equivalent to BB042+BB043 in the SHLAA] should be considered as housing allocations in the Local Plan; and that these are more suitable than alternatives such as BB040, BB041 and BB054 in green belt/flood risk/sustainability etc terms.	- A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - BB042 & BB043 were assessed as C in the SHLAA and were not considered suitable for development
PO9474	Mrs S Edwards				Object	Options Site BB044 - Blythe Bridge As a previous member of the district council and being involved with planning and the Local Development Frame Work (now I understand under a different name) same problems. You/We/Parish/Public have all to make a decision as to which are the best sites. Nobody wants it behind them, or in their street, or patch. Nobody wants to see the greenbelt changed, yet most of the people who object, live in areas that were all in the greenbelt not so many years ago. If not them, then their family or friends, We have a big problem, A BIG ONE. We need housing not only for first time buyers, or retiring people, families, that are expanding and wishing to move on and full-fill their needs. The government of the day. In fact all involved realise this has to happen. Numbers are given and deadlines have to be met. We unfortunately cannot please everyone. We need to make a decision, and	See response to PO8259

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						that's not easy far from it. Greenbelt unfortunately has to be removed, so we can allow these things to happen. Difficult for everyone, I know. But the job has to be done. I feel we have already been at this choosing stage far to long. We must move on NOW. We cannot keep changing our minds, or introducing sites that now are being termed as preferred sites. We need to have an on going strategy and make a positive, considered choice. I don't think we are doing that right now. The numbers given, obviously does mean more than one site some large some small. Most have some problems. I don't know any sites that have none. I am not talking of the objections made by the general objectors bur the real problems, we need to choose those with the least, and also least costly, or dangerous. Ok so where do we go from here? Enough Instructions' The preferred sites in this area (Forsbrook & Blythe Bridge) are now being given priority. In some cases not as good as those as these we have looked at previously. Take only the genuine objections not personnel ones. Consider which have the most expensive difficulties and dismiss them if not viable. Highways have made comments on sites for example BB044 that is not likely to create more traffic than was created with its previous use by Boarding Kennels. The Highways do not have as many problems road wise when it's a No Through Road the number of dwellings beyond this site are a bungalow, two houses, and three properties over the unmade road over a long distance. The access to site BB044 is wide enough to support the services and a footpath to the highway. You are bound to say, well she would say that when she is involved in its ownership. The two preferred sites are both located on busy 'Rat Runs' that are too dangerous to take more through traffic. Difficulties at junctions with main thoroughfares, such as the Draycoott Old	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Road and the junction with Cheadle Road on a very bad bend. Also if turning right out of this site the width of the carriageway is extremely narrow and very dangerous. This would surely be prohibitive to improve because of the cost. This site has no defendable boundaries. I therefore suggest that SMDC supports Site BB044 Chapel Street as being one of the approved sites for Forsbrook & Blythe Bridge.	
PO9679	Brenda Matthews				Object	(Summarised) Support for proposed Travellers site at Blythe Bridge however concerned about security of adjacent land which houses stables (and horses) due to the location of the site and adjacent footpath. Ask to consider moving the green belt boundary so it would allow us to put in a planning application for a 3 bedroom house within the curtilage of our stable block to allow us to be close to our horses. (Maps attached - showing location).	Support noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer response
PO2561	Mrs Chadwick	Ipstones Parish Council			Object	SUMMARY ONLY - FULL COMMENTS ATTACHED Several letters have been received from the parish council regarding the site allocations for Ipstones and Foxt. Consider very strongly that the proposed sites for Ipstones and Foxt are not suitable for development and a 'flexible infill' policy would be suitable for both villages. Proposed site in Foxt is the only Industrial Site within the village and currently used for two existing businesses – important to keep. Allocation of houses should be flexible 'infill' to keep the character of the hamlet. Lists suggested infill sites for Foxt.	- Site FO008 was not included as a preferred options site. Re-development of existing employment sites would need to be considered against national guidance and policies in the adopted local Plan. - It is not intended to make specific allocations for housing in the smaller villages including Foxt. - Suggested Infill Sites - there are likely to be suitable infill plots which could contribute towards the small windfall allowance for the rural area, subject to material planning considerations.
PO9649	Mr M Brindley				Object	Land off Mount Pleasant, Foxt I would like to put forward the small plot of land between Mount Pleasant and Greenbank Farm for consideration of outline planning for two small bungalows. This site has access to the main road and all services are nearby. It is a small plot of land that is not viable for agricultural use. It would have no adverse effect on the local environment and it would be ideal development for retirement properties.	This site is too small to be allocated and lies to the north of Foxt, outside the main part of the village.
PO1631 PO1618	Mrs Lisa Buckley Mr David Buckley				Support	I watch with interest the changing proposal for the housing development in Foxt. It was recently published that the suitable brown field on what is current land to the rear of and including Barks Garage was identified as being suitable for future housing development. I feel strongly that this proposed site is ideal for the following reasons. Because of its location it would have little or no impact on the overall visual nature and image of the village. There would be no access issues. A current brownfield site which may be unsustainable by the nature of its business and changing economic climate may become readily available. It would ideally fulfill part of the overall development plan for the district in what is a sensitive plan to become a area of outstanding natural beauty. Any other proposal of for the extension of our further inclusion of housing development would be wholly unacceptable as they would have a severe damaging effect and impact on the nature of the village its road infrastructure the environment and the people living within it . To contemplate the use of existing 'green spaces ' within the village for houses would destroy the very nature and feel of Foxt.	- See response to PO2561 regarding FO008. - Support for new housing in the village is noted. - The smaller villages such as Foxt have a more limited role as service centres, but they are vital to the rural areas particularly in terms of providing for local housing and rural employment needs.
PO1630	Mr K Morris				Support	We used to own and run a guest house at Shay lane foxt for 13years successfully and loved the village so when we decided to retire just over 3 years ago we thought it would be nice to stay in the village, but unfortunately there was nothing available to purchase and it seems such a shame that this beautiful little village is in so much need for some revitalisation. We saw the closure of the pub the post office and	Comments noted. See response to PO1631.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer response
						the village shop while we were there and landlords at the public house change quite often due to the lack of trade in such a small community. IT is very rare that once the children in the village are old enough to purchase a property for themselves they have to look further afield leaving there loved ones behind as there is nothing available for them to purchase. We do hope this village gets the revitalisation to needs to move with the next generation	
PO1612	Mrs Shirley Sugars				Support	Proposed site for building houses at the garage and land at the rear of W Barks and son. Foxt as I'm aware this land been up for development for a number of years. I regard this site as the best place in the village for Houses. It will enhance the village for the better to use this land than good meadow land. I have lived in the village for 45 years and fully support this site.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008.
PO1611	Mr Vernon Whilock				Support	This proposed site has been recommended for development for many years. I have lived in the village for 45 years and I think this site is the most suitable for development and will be an advantage and the in keeping to the village. I most certainly give my full support for this site is and I hope you will look on it favourably.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008.
PO1627	Mary Stenstrom-Blackburn				Support	We are aware that the district council has identified the land adjacent to our property (Oak Cottage Foxt) for possible future housing development and this land has been recognised as an Amber Area. We have no objection in principle to a small development as this would be regenerating a Brown Field site to the use of much needed housing. We would hope that this development would include the change of industrial buildings to residential housing as this would considerably improve the environment and landscaping adjacent to our property. We would strongly object to any further development either to the rear of our property or to the side, which is the land between our property and Brook Cottage as this land is agricultural. We believe the proposed development should be a small development with no more than 6-8 properties (we would be particularly supportive if the development did include 7 bungalows) we believe some of the elderly residents of Foxt identified this in particular need for the village, and because there are very few bungalows, several elderly residents have had to move out of Foxt into bungalows of the neighbouring villages. This letter is voluntary. We would appreciate that we keep informed of all the developments proposals regarding this issue. If you need to contact us, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008.
PO1626	Ms J A Walker				Support	It has recently come to our notice that there is a proposal to develop a brownfield site in the village of Foxt, on the land which is directly behind the garage belonging to Barry Barks and family, for the purpose of building new houses. We would welcome, approve and fully Support the development of this land for a suitable number of houses. (And	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer response
						appropriate type of housing) We have lived in Foxt for 30 yrs our house was the last house to be built in the village. We feel the development of this land will improve and enhance the village and the people that live in the surrounding area. Also access to land would not be an issue. The proposal for the development other parcels of land is welcome but the future over development of other parcels of land in Foxt should not be encouraged.	
PO1606	Mr Roger Walter Davies				Support	FO008 I am writing to you as a resident of Foxt for nearly 65 yrs, development in our village is greatly needed as it over 30yrs since any houses have been constructed. I would like to register my support of the suggested development of the area on which central garage and barks garage are situated, and the land to the rear off these buildings. This site would be the best area to situate new houses, rather than building them on green fields, and being in central part of the village, it would enhance the area rather than infill up and down. I am supporting this application on this site, as I know Mr Brindley and Mr Barks would like to relocate to a more suitable area. Mr Barks for logistical reasons Mr Brindley to a town centre with more passing trade. I hope my views will be considered in this matter.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008
PO1615	Mr D Hammond				Support	As a resident of Foxt for the past 27 years, I am writing in full support of the proposed development of the land at the rear of the R Barks Garage premises, (including the existing Haulage yard) and incorporating the premises of MB Autos. Much press coverage both locally, has addressed the need to provide more housing, and the consequence necessity of villages being accepting of some development in this respect. The above proposal seems very limited intrusion to the overall aesthetics of Foxt village. Strong support of the villagers, to which I wish to add my 'our voice'.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008
PO1608	Mr D Williams				Support	Having seen the proposals for Foxt I am concerned that the provision of housing by infill will not entirely the demand for starter homes and bungalows for older people. Several people in Fox have expressed the wish to remain here in their old age into suitable accommodation. Provided this is specified in any proposal for Foxt I am in favour of them, particularly if they are sensitive unobtrusive unlike modern constructions already in Foxt.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008
PO9650	Mr M Brindley				Object	Further to the meeting at Ipstones last week, I propose to register an interest for change of use for my vehicle repair business due to a lack of trade and in need to move to a more populated area with more passing trade. Foxt is a very quiet village off the beaten track, and even with numerous advertising it has had very little effect so therefore I feel it is time to move the business to a more vibrant area. I feel this site would be an ideal site to be developed for residential use.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer response
PO1628	Mrs B Brindley				Support	I have resided in the village of foxt for 50years and have seen most of the children having to leave the village due to no affordable housing with the older generation in a similar situation. Having nowhere to downsize (i.e: retirement bungalows so they can vacate family homes for the younger generations). The village needs to generate more population in order to survive as we already lost the school, post office and shop and the local public house/restaurant is finding it trade hard.	Comments noted.
PO1607	Mrs M Cooke				Support	I write to support the idea of development of the current haulage ford of R Barks, together with the existing garage and that of its neighbour M.S Autos. This proposed development to provide additional much needed housing for Foxt, is very much ?? by many villagers, including myself , and I therefore commend it to you.	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008
PO1629	Mrs C Clowes				Support	I am writing in support of MB Autos and Barks Transport in their application to have housing on this site they both own. Foxt is in great need of pensioner's bungalows, and affordable housing and as this would be brownfield site so not using green belt land I wish to support them	See response to PO1631 regarding site option FO008
PO569	Mr Peter Cowie				General comment	The villages of the Staffordshire Moorlands are unique in terms of landscape. Everything should be done towards their conservation and the retention of their special character. SMDC should make powerful representations to central govt on these grounds such that housing numbers are amended.	- Adopted Core Strategy SS6b – Smaller Villages Area Strategy strictly controls new development, both in terms of scale and type to ensure that the character of the village is not undermined. - The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4496	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	In relation to housing allocations for rural areas, the site owner wishes to reserve their right to object to this matter as the plan progresses and information comes to light.	Comment noted
PO4713	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	Not at this stage.	Comment noted.
PO686	Mr Ivor Moseley				General comment	This comment is about Hollington which doesn't appear on the list. I don't object to more housing coming to Hollington but it is a "linear" village and the infill site is already full. There is much more space for housing along the main rd, which could be used. However the site of the derelict Co-op dairy seems the obvious place to put a housing development for the Checkley Parish area.	No site allocations are proposed in Hollington
PO7436	Mr Derek Wragg				General comment	Housing Issues - Loss of housing stock by properties being converted and incorporated into a single dwelling in most instances, due to residents needs but in later years become under occupied. Loss due to second homes only utilised for short periods . Solutions - Construction of affordable starter homes in Hollington and Checkley Parish. Issues - Ageing residents create under occupancy due to bereavement or health reasons etc. Solutions - Construction of retirement homes or complex within the parish boundary if required. Issues - Housing sites in two locations proposed in the village in 2015 delineated on Greenfield sites. H002 - H2003 respectively. Solutions - Use of non Greenfield sites for the use of houses and affordable homes in Hollington would be a more acceptable solution. Issues - Need to maintain Hollingtons historic heritage the Fabric and Landscape of a working rural village. Solutions - Maintain the natural stone features for the construction of dwellings its characteristic stone walling open green spaces and natural wildlife habitats. Issues - Imbalance due to the granting of planning permission mainly for tourism use in relation to starter homes and retirement homes needs addressing. Employment Issues - Transport costs and the issue of affordable housing is the main factor for younger people seeking employment locally or one of the main industrialised towns. Solutions - Promote tourism – Rural science. Diversification of farming activities – small business integration allied to farming; Land drainage contractors, Fencing contracors, Tree surgeons, Dry stone walling contractors, Working from homesteads. Retailing Loss of 2 Shops; 1 Post Office in the village. Solutions - Grant planning for Retail Outlets without these facilities the village is an	- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. - No housing allocations are proposed in Hollington, limited development will be permitted if it is in accord with the countryside policies in the Local Plan - Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable. - Any new developments would need to adhere to design policies to ensure character of the District is maintained. - The policies in the Local Plan seek to allow appropriate development in the countryside to maintain the rural economy and protect community facilities - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. - The Local Plan contains polices regarding biodiversity and a Green Infrastructure Plan has been prepared alongside the Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						isolated rural community. Infrastructure Issues - JCB volume of traffic converging on narrow roads (inconsistent speed limits of 30 40 and 60mph in Hollington village.) Speeding traffic converging on to narrow roads; there are 5 intersections that are blind spots with little or no visibility. No road markings hence vehicles drive in the centre of the carriageway. Solution - Standardize the limit to 30 mph and implement traffic calming, possible consultation with Staffordshire Highways Authority for appraisal re additional traffic with introduction of new golf course. Issues - Car parking at Village Hall and Church is limited to virtually on road parking during heavy demand. Solutions - Integrate parking and traffic calming; in the event of any possible housing schemes being granted planning permission and allow clear egress from the development. Issues - Public transport only 1 bus per week to Uttoxeter. Solutions - Link to bus routes in Fole or Tean the village is at present an Isolated Rural Community especially for the elder residents who do not drive or unable to drive. Issues - Public Utilities ability to cope with the additional demands No high speed broadband consistent problems with phone lines some properties not on main sewers etc. Solutions - Feasibility study of public utilities including micro-medicine technology encapsulating super fast broadband and possible use of the local church spire for wi-fi high speed hub on failure of Openreach being able to supply adequate services. Issues - Protection of wildflower meadows and wildlife migration corridors and habitats. Solutions - Environmental assessment and consultation with wildlife trust to determine possibility and status of proposed areas.	
PO582	Mrs Sandra Peck				General comment	The use of brown field sites needs to be considered when building new homes in Hollington.	No housing allocations are proposed in Hollington the Local Plan will contain a policy regarding development in the countryside.
PO7526		Hollington Residents' Steering Group			General comment	Summary of Representation - Please see attached letter A residents group has been established to improve communications, represent views of villagers and liaise with stakeholders. Hollington is a working village with three operational quarries; There are no footpaths within the main village and traffic speed limits are inconsistent; High volumes of traffic are generated by local schools; Villagers want to build on their homesteads to accommodate older and younger relatives but cant get planning permission; Preference for holiday accommodation; Both option sites are	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with the criteria based policy in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						coded amber; the proposed infill boundary provides little or no capacity for development; there are numerous smaller sites elsewhere within the village boundary that would better assimilate new housing, without adversely affecting the character of the village; urge SMDC to utilise brown fields rather than green fields; development of Oldhams office site could provide village and church hall parking. Ask SMDC to maintain the rural character of Hollington by: Actively promoting development on Homesteads to ensure continuity for employment; consider smaller development areas on homesteads and brownfield sites throughout the village; Bring forward the development of the Fole Diary site. Attached table of issues, options and links.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2922	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer (SCC)			IP019	General comment	In Ipstones Site IP019 will require alterations to the carriageway to achieve visibility, which should be acceptable subject to detailed design.	Comments noted.
PO3865	Mr D Perry				IP019	Object	By building on their site it will effect and could end our animal Agricultural Show which is part of our Moorland heritage. This development will greatly increase traffic along Church Lane into High Street. It is almost impossible most days to into High Street. It is almost impossible most days to drive through our Ipstones with queuing. Emergency vehicles have reported serious delays getting through Ipstones. Our Parish Council has an infill policy in place and is confident the required number of new houses will be built.	- Comments noted regarding the location of the Agricultural Show. There may be other sites in the village which could accommodate this event. - The Highways Authority consider that highways & access to the site is acceptable subject to design and provision of visibility. The site will require alterations to the carriageway to achieve visibility, which should be acceptable subject to detailed design. - Small infill sites that can accommodate residential development within the village boundary can contribute to the small site windfall allowance for the Rural Area.
PO3864	Ms Lesley Richards				IP019	Object	Church Lane already has a busy flow of traffic and gets extremely congested around the junction with High Street/Frogghall Road. A further housing estate would escalate this problem. The proposed site is used for the Agricultural Show each year which is an important part of this village. It provides access to the main show ground and it is where many other events take place including the Shire Horse Judging. I support the infill proposal.	- See response to PO3865 regarding village show. - See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding infill.
PO3885	Mr and Mrs P R Frazer				IP019	Object	Having come to Ipstones 48 years ago to live on the high street, we have noticed over the years the large increase in traffic through the village. Any increase in building would be unacceptable to those of us who already live here as this would affect a further increase in traffic and place and place an unsustainable strain on village facilities.	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.
PO1117	Ms M McGowan-Griffin				IP019	Object	I am writing again to reiterate my concerns over the 'preferred' site for development in Ipstones, i.e. the field situated directly behind my house. From a personal perspective this development would obviously be a disaster, having only recently purchased and redeveloped the plot to house a very expensive new build. The house was specifically designed to take in the views to the rear of our property (the preferred development site) and we are now in the process of completing a balcony (passed by planning) that directly overlooks this same site. The house has two very large picture windows downstairs and two patio doors to an upstairs balcony, all of which overlook the site in question. Housing on this site would of course not only spoil the views we thought we were buying, but also cause us and any residents we would overlook, privacy issues. Aside from how this proposal would affect me personally, it is just about the worst site choice from an access point of view and should it go ahead would be a disaster waiting to happen. Church Lane currently has major traffic problems at the junction with High Street, a narrow road with little or no pavement in some places. Virtually all the traffic in Church Lane travels in the	- Loss of view and property values are non-material planning considerations. - Amenity – issues such as overlooking, screening will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. - See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding infill.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							general direction of the High Street, so further housing development in this area of Church Lane would only compound this very real problem. Notwithstanding the above issues, there is the one of how access to the proposed site would be gained. As the current lane is inadequate for the proposed development, we have been approached more than once to sell part of our garden to enable access. As advised previously, we still have no intention of giving up any of our garden for this purpose. I realise that there is a need further affordable/single floor housing in Ipstones, for our old and young and that everyone could say 'not on my doorstep'. I hope however that all things considered, the council will reconsider the option of large scale developments, particularly those that affect Church Lane and instead consider an infill policy, which by all accounts is doable within the number and time constraints provided.	
PO1119	Ms Jackie Wilbraham				IP019	Object	I am writing to object most strongly to the allocation of housing to the village of Ipstones. I have set out my reasons below :- Additional housing in Ipstones is not required and would be totally out of character in such rural setting within the Churnet Valley. The proposed developments would ruin the aesthetic appeal of this area of the Staffordshire Moorlands which is rich in heritage buildings and reduce the attraction to tourists with the consequential loss in trade to businesses reliant on tourism. The roads are insufficient to accommodate any increase in traffic and are already congested at certain times in Ipstones already. There is no requirement for the additional housing proposed. The environmental impact of any additional housing would be significant. Such developments would increase the noise and light pollution, which would be detrimental to existing wild life in the area and detract from the peace and serenity of the countryside. The proposal is incongruous with the vision for the Churnet Valley as an area of outstanding natural beauty. Instead, there is a requirement for houses in Towns and the Potteries conurbation. In parts of Stoke, Hanley and the Potteries, large areas of houses have been demolished. That is exactly the place where new houses should be built. The infrastructure is already in place and employment opportunities are available. The SMDC local plan lacks a strategic approach, instead being a scatter gun style that places houses in every hamlet and village in the area. I propose that the SMDC transfer their allocation of housing from Foxt and Ipstones to Stoke City Council where housing is seriously required and work in partnership to ensure that SMDC retains the financial incentive for housing from Government which it would otherwise receive.	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • The Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) considers that the site is visually prominent when viewed from the cemetery and from land to the west. In order to reduce visual prominence development could be limited to the eastern part of the site, not extending beyond the gardens of development to the north. • There is one Grade II* and 27 Grade II listed buildings, and one Conservation Area within the 400m buffer. Development would be likely to adversely affect the setting of the church to the north of the site. It suggests that these could be reduced by restricting development to the eastern half of the site. • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the Districts housing requirement is met.
PO3879	Mr & Mrs P and J Salmon				IP019	Object	I feel I must object to any plans to build a new estate on Church Lane Ipstones, firstly any new extra traffic would be danger and secondly the area of Stock Green ? Is one of if not one of the older areas of Ipstones, and is not suitable for any new developments,	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO3865 regarding infill.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							which would be out of context with the present cottages. Infill in the village is needed and I am sure this can be sorted out.	
PO527	Mrs Elizabeth Fitzgibbon				IP019	Object	I live on Church Lane, so obviously any housing development is going to affect me and my family directly, however the choice of IP019 off Church Lane as the preferred option is detrimental to the village as a whole and seems completely at odds with common sense. There were several other alternative sites proposed that would be far better options. I am not against increased housing in the village in principle as it will help keep the village 'alive' by increasing use of the school, shop, village hall and pubs. I just think the site chosen is the wrong one. An extra 35 houses off Church Lane will generate at least 70 more cars using Church Lane daily to access High Street/Froghall Road via the pinch point at the junction where the shop and The Marquis mean reduced access because of parked vehicles. This is already a known and much discussed highways problem which this housing development would make far worse. It is only a matter of time before an emergency vehicle is blocked with potentially fatal consequences. Please do not add to this problem when there are better alternatives. The use of this field for housing will also impact directly on Ipstones Show. This is the main public event in the village each year with visitors from far and wide. It would seem madness to put its continued success in jeopardy when better alternatives are available. A sensible option has been put forward in recent weeks using infill and reuse of part of the industrial estate on Froghall Road. I would support this alternative. Furthermore, The site on Froghall Road (IP014a) is a preferable option to the current proposal as it would not cause the same level of traffic congestion with direct access to the main road. Nor would it impact the Ipstones Show. In addition, the Land off High street to the west (which has not been considered at all) close to Daisy Bank Farm would also be a better choice providing the access road was linked through to Church Meadow. This option would in fact ease the congestion on Church Lane and actually reduce the traffic levels at the junction of Church Lane and High Street. it would provide an alternative route out of the village for those living in Church Lane, Church Meadow, and the new houses. My overriding feeling is that of all the possible sites in the village, the very worst choice has been made. Please reconsider.	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO3865 regarding the village show. • Far Lane Industrial Estate provides an opportunity for local businesses and employment and the Core Strategy safeguards good quality employment sites. Part re-development of the site for residential use could cause amenity issues. • IP014a was considered at the Site options stage. There are a number of constraints to this site such as no pedestrian access, affected by historic landfill and potential contamination issues, and important landscape to the setting of the village. • Sites off High Street, close to Daisy Bank Farm have been assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA). This area makes an important contribution to the Conservation Area including historic boundaries and walls and was not taken forward to the site options stage.
PO3892	Mr and Mrs JM Flint				IP019	Object	I write to object to both sites IP011 and IP019 in Church Lane Ipstones on the following grounds: The traffic congestion at the junction of Church Lane and High Street Ipstones makes any development serves by Church Lane highly undesirable's the prospect of 35 new houses with 70+ cars is alarming. The new development of Grade 4 agricultural land is not desirable. IP011 will have a bad impact on the core of the ancient village. IP019 will have a bad effect on the agricultural show (horse events) IP011 will take the field used as an essential carpark for the agricultural show I	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO3865 regarding infill.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							consider that for the Ipstones, infill is a much better solution.	
PO3895	Mrs G Shuttleworth				IP019	Object	Ipstones does not need a housing estate, as there is numerous infill sites which would blend more sympathetically planners should look at cottages in Brookfield Road and Stocks Green that have stood the test of time, and replicate this style for the future community lies in the hands of younger people. No movie 'execu hire' houses!	See response to PO3865 regarding infill.
PO4700	Miss H Biddulph				IP019	Object	Last autumn, SMDC consulted us on a possible housing site for 2011 to 2031. They have narrowed the sites down as shown on the plan. IP019 (part of the Show Fields) is their "preferred" option. IP019 (the Show Car Park field between Church Meadows and the Vicarage) and IP014a (between Belmont Road and the 'Rec',) are now "Reserve" sites to be used if IP019 cannot be used. The sites adjacent to the Old Vicarage and New House Farm have been discarded. The numbers of houses have increased from 25 to 35. This leaves the preferred site and one of the reserves sites served off Church Lane. The present traffic problems in Church Lane and its junction with High Street make the extra traffic which is generated by 35 more houses highly undesirable. Site IP019 takes on agricultural lane, site IP019 takes Green Fields agricultural land, several large mature trees and seriously affects much used Public Footpath. Both will further expand the built-up Village rather than consolidating it with the selected infill sites.	- See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - Public footpath does not cross IP019.
PO3868	Mrs Deborah Leftwich				IP019	Object	Loss of view it over looks over Site IP019. Beautiful fields and view we do not want this to be taken away. Ipstones agricultural show also uses this land may threaten the future of this show. The show is important to Ipstones. Most importantly increased traffic on Church Lane. Already, in a particular at the start of Church Lane near the shops and the pub. There are currently problems with parking in Church Lane. Housing would further increase this. Access and exit onto Church Lane for proposed housing would be almost impossible and dangerous.	- See response to PO1119 regarding landscape - See response to PO3865 regarding the village show.
PO3869	Ms Amy Leftwich				IP019	Object	Loss of view, increased traffic onto Church Lane increased parking at junction on Church Lane, difficult exit/access, threat to agricultural show.	- Loss of view is a non-material planning consideration. - See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding the village show.
PO3891	Mr and Mrs P & K Ashton				IP019	Object	Our major concerns refer to the effects of increased traffic flows along Church Lane, There are, with the existing volumes of traffic, occasions when the congestion and parking problems alongside the Marquis of Granby and the One Stop Shop present major problems for the motorists and pedestrians. It is worth noting that each school day a supervised crocodile of young children have to make its way along Church Lane to and from Playgroup to Ipstones Primary School. The final bend at the bottom of Church Lanes, leading to the junction with Froghall Road, is downhill, has an adverse camber and is blind with regard to parked or oncoming traffic. It can be cause problems at the best of times. These are problems exacerbated during icy snowy conditions, since Church Lane is no longer on the local authority gritting route. The increased	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							traffic flow caused by a new housing development involving Church Lane can only make the existing problems even worse.	
PO3867	Mrs Jeannette Simpson				IP019	Object	Solely on the traffic congestion. A real worry very difficult to negotiate the village at times now. Emergency services?	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.
PO1011	Mrs Alison Cartledge				IP019	Object	The Church Lane proposed development land in Ipstones is wholly inappropriate as it will add massively to the already congested minor road and the blocked square in the village which is constantly choked with traffic. There is already a safety issue with cars pulling out onto Church Lane from the village hall car park and emergency vehicles cannot access the road around the Grove corner. As a resident at the top of church lane this is a highly alarming problem. The number of houses proposed is extremely excessive and all the extra cars and residents will place too much strain on a small Moorlands community. The utility supply to these extra homes would also impact upon other residents properties as the current water pressure is not sufficient to supply these homes.	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.
PO3894	Mrs R Flint				IP019	Object	The dire traffic situation at the Junction of Church Lane and High Street is so so dangerous now- and any extra properties in Church Lane, thereby adding an extra 70 or so vehicles will be death to someone at this junction and for 100 yds in each direction from.	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.
PO197	Mrs Sue Higton				IP019	General comment	The location seems fairly sensible but I'd suggest that any development would need to be supported by highway improvements and conditions. The village is already struggling with traffic issues, particularly in High Street and Church Lane, which wouldn't be helped by additional traffic from new housing. Villages like ours were not designed for cars - small terraced houses often have 2 or 3 vehicles and no parking facilities - so a resident's car park and sensible on-street parking restrictions would help.	See response to PO3865 regarding highways.
PO258	Mr Graham Leftwich				IP019	Object	The proposed development site would lead to a significant increase in traffic along Church Lane. the junction of Church Lane and High Street is already too busy and unsuitable for increased traffic - particularly the heavy traffic that developing the site would entail. Using the site for housing would threaten the future viability of the Ipstones Show, the single most important community event of the year in Ipstones. There is no suitable access to the site from Church Lane. Development of the site would be visually intrusive for the neighbouring properties, my own included, which currently enjoy open views of the countryside. There are other, more suitable sites for further housing development in the village with access from High Street or Froghall Road - notably the land next to and behind the fire station, extending development along Belmont Road and the land between Church Meadow and High Street, marked on the map as Daisy Bank Farm. Indeed, the design of Church Meadow clearly shows it was anticipated to continue building towards High Street.	- See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding the village show. - Loss of view is a non-material planning consideration. - IP015 (land adjacent to the fire station) was considered at the Site options stage. There are a number of constraints to this site such as the adverse impact on adjacent New House Farm and Tearn Farmhouse opposite which are both listed buildings, the land is identified as important landscape to the setting of the village and the availability of the site is unknown. - See response to PO527 regarding the land adjacent to Daisy Bank Farm.
PO14	Mrs Rachel Rickers				IP019	Object	The proposed site would see an unacceptable increase in traffic and congestion through the village as a whole but also on Church Lane where access for the new properties would lie. The road is	- See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding the village show.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							extremely narrow around the corner past the Marquis of Granby public house and already over used by people using the pub and the shop. The building of more properties would see a substantial increase in traffic making it congested and unsafe in the long term let alone with building traffic in the short term. There is also a community impact with the loss of land used for village events through the year. In addition added pressure will be added to the school in the village.	Staffordshire County Council have indicated that St Leonards CE(VA) First School is likely to be able to accommodate the additional children generated by the proposed allocated housing although there may be a need for education contributions to accommodate additional children.
PO4692 PO4693	Mr A Maslen Mrs A Maslen				IP019	Object	We are writing in relation to the SMDC Consultation Document concerning the proposed allocation and siting of the new build housing for Ipstones. We have been extremely concerned over the Council's preferred site IP019 in Church Lane and the increase in the number of houses proposed from 25 (2015) to 35 this year. We have several objections to this site. Any increase in traffic from tenant's cars, and the delivery vehicles etc. would aggravate the already hazardous access into Church Lane from High Street and we consider being totally unacceptable, despite the Council Highways Department thinking there would be no problem with the site. Site IP019 plays an important occasion for village residents and visitors alike and represents the sharing of a village tradition. There is no obvious alternative adjacent to the field which can be used. So it is clear why Ipstones residents do not wish this site to be turned into housing. There have been several 'estate' developments in Ipstones in the past which in the eyes of older residents have already altered the character of the village. Our last point is this narrow access site form Church Lane itself and this would involve encroaching on the land of at least 2 adjacent properties. So after attending the Parish Council meeting and hearing the views of Councillor Sybil Ralph's, and reading the subsequent reports of this in the Leek Post, we wish to thank her for her reassurance's that the an infill and policy Is preferable for Ipstones, both from a safety angle and because it would safeguard the character of the village, but would still meet the required target numbers. Councillor Ralphs assured the meeting that the housing number now been revised down to the original 25. Of these at 5 infill houses have been built there already since 2011. We fully support the Parish Council proposed to have infill policy using the unoccupied premises on a small industrial site at the south end of Ipstones. This site could offer a minimum of 10 additional house's especially these are smaller 'affordable' homes more suited to the new buyers like younger people attending the Parish Council meeting want and support the Parish Council on this. There are several other possible 'one house' infill sites around the village which could make up the final total pf 25 houses. One example is on Frogghall Road, a previous garden or allotment site between bungalows and ex council houses. I believe the Parish Council has other one off sites too. So please listen to what Ipstones residents want for their own village and accept the views	- See response to PO3865 regarding highways. - See response to PO3865 regarding the village show. - See response to PO527 regarding Far Lane Industrial Estate. - See response to PO3865 regarding infill opportunities.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site Reference	Support/ object/ general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							of both our Parish Council and Councillor Ralphs and reject the site IP019 from your plans.	
PO3863	Mrs Linda Perry				IP019	Object	We have serious problems with traffic in Ipstones particularly on the High Street/Froghall Road due to parked cars. The junction of High Street gets seriously congested and emergency vehicles have problems getting along Church Lane. We do not need another housing estate in Ipstones. Our housing needs can be met by our Parish Councils infill policy. To build on the proposed site (which is used for our agricultural Show) could seriously affect a very important part of our village heritage. There are alternative Brownfield Sites I fully support the Infill Policy which will provide enough extra housing.	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO3865 regarding the village show. • See response to PO3865 regarding infill.
PO3866	Mr and Mrs H and B Hart				IP019	Object	We object to the 'preferred' site IP019 of housing sites in Ipstones escalate the already dangerous traffic situation on Church Lane following a meeting of the Ipstones Parish Council on Tuesday the 31 st May 2016, attended by Sybil Ralphs, we unanimously against that the best solution would be to adopt an 'infill' policy whereby numerous small sites around the village be used to accommodate new houses. In addition a small estate of houses is built on land in the south end of the village, on land currently housing some small industrial units. The village would benefit some small starter homes & retirement bungalows. If there was a need to re-accommodate industrial units then I understand that there is suitable space down at Froghall.	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO527 regarding Far Lane Industrial Estate. • See response to PO3865 regarding infill opportunities. • Refer to responses to QU37 relating to the Bolton Copperworks site at Froghall .
PO1082	Mr T Irwin				IP019	Object	With all the traffic congestion at junction of High Street and church, don't see how anybody with any common sense can put this plan forward. Sheer madness. Also taking up fields used by Ipstones show. What about land by fire station.	• See response to PO3865 regarding highways. • See response to PO258 regarding land by the fire station.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee comments	Officer response
PO2561	Mrs Chadwick	Ipstones Parish Council			Object	- SUMMARY ONLY. Several letters have been received from the parish council regarding the site allocations for Ipstones and Foxt. Consider very strongly that the proposed sites for Ipstones and Foxt are not suitable for development and a 'flexible infill' policy would be suitable for both villages. - Suggest using the first two units on the industrial estate in Froghall Road for affordable houses. Understand owner would be agreeable to this. Lists included suggesting infill sites for Ipstones. - Affordable housing for local young people is needed. Redundant barns that may be suitable for residential conversion should be taken into account. Planning approvals should be taken into account.	- Agreed that there is a need for affordable housing in the rural area. This is more difficult to achieve on infill sites compared to allocated housing sites. - Far Lane Industrial Estate provides an opportunity for local businesses and employment and the Core Strategy safeguards good quality employment sites. Part re-development of the site for residential use could cause amenity issues. - Suggested Infill Sites - There are likely to be suitable infill plots within the settlement boundary which can contribute towards the small windfall allowance for the rural area, subject to material planning considerations. - There may also be opportunities for rural housing which are located outside the development boundary in sustainable locations such as barn conversions. These will also contribute towards the small windfall allowance for the rural area. - Sites off High Street, close to Daisy Bank Farm and Hawes Farm have been assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA). This area makes an important contribution to the Conservation Area including historic boundaries and walls.
PO3862	Dr J Cope				Object	IP011 - I am writing with reference to the proposed developments on land off Church Lane, Ipstones I must object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals as it would be a terrible loss to village community and a wide range of wildlife, not only that, it would be a detrimental to the character of the village as a whole. This is especially irking given the much more suitable proposed land at Froghall, just outside the village, which is crying out for re-development – it would clean up a depressing eye-sore and actually add to the local community. Coming back to the proposed site of Church lane, I and/or my wife walk there most days on the public footpath that runs through the site, with my dog and meet up with many other village residents who use and enjoy the footpath through this area. We have conversations and the dogs play together it's a special village community aspect that would be lost if the land were developed for housing. There is important wildlife that would be lost and impacted on too. I am a volunteer with the RSPB at nearby Coombes Valley and an active member of Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and see evidence of a wide variety of Wildlife every day, on the proposed site, that thrive in this area. Red list bird species such as, Song Thrush, Mistle Thrush and House Sparrow and Nuthatches. Tree Creepers, Great Spotted and Green Woodpeckers. Rooks and occasional Ravens, Swallows and Martins. The list goes on.	- Site IP011 was not included as a preferred options site. - Refer to responses to QU37 relating to the Bolton Copperworks site at Froghall.
PO4702	Mr & Mrs J & F Mundy				Object	SMDC. Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan – April 2016 We attended a very well organised and well supported meeting at the Village Hall in Ipstones. The depth of feeling against the proposed development at Church Lane was demonstrated by a unanimous vote "against" the proposal by people present. By this time you	Site IP011 was not included as a preferred options site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee comments	Officer response
						are probably aware of the details discussed at the meeting. Something not discussed however was how the elected minorities seek to impose their will on the majorities they respect – what happened to democracy? On Channel 4 Radio, on Sunday the 12 th June a very significant statement was made by Roger Screwton of the Princes Foundation. He said development of areas scheduled for house building was already decided when residents were informed true or not? The land scheduled for building new houses no 15 IP011 is agricultural land, owned by a farmer and presumably stored for cattle feed. The entrance to Church Lane from the High Street is circled by a one stop shop, a butcher and a public house, all of which take regular delivery vehicles in large delivery trucks. There are times when it is very difficult to turn into Church Lane from the High Street (there is a bus stop and the dropping off of school children) One can imagine the situation if as stated 35 much more cars (possible many more) will add to further congestion. Heaven help anyone who needs the ambulance or fire engine in an emergency. Ipstones is a village, not a dormitory town. Every year there is a long standing agricultural show guess where everyone parks their vehicles on this occasion No 15 IP011.	
PO3893	Mr and Mrs JM Flint				Object	I write to object to both sites IP011 in Church Lane Ipstones on the following grounds: - The traffic congestion at the junction of Church Lane and High Street Ipstones makes any development serves by Church Lane highly undesirable's the prospect of 35 new houses with 70+ cars is alarming. The new development of Grade 4 agricultural land is not desirable. - IP011 will have a bad impact on the core of the ancient village. - IP011 will take the field used as an essential carpark for the agricultural show. I consider that for the Ipstones, infill is a much better solution.	Site IP011 was not included as a preferred options site.
PO949	Mr and Mrs Antelo				Object	Further to your notification we would like to reiterate our objections to building on plot IPo11 We would be overlooked and enclosed in if this should happen. We have lived here 20 years and have now retired and do not want to hear the hum-drum of Lorries etc. thundering up and down our lane. As its name suggests this is a lane not a road. We would lose our views completely. We brought this property with the understanding that IP011 would never be built on. Church Lane cannot cope with extra traffic. It gets congested most days. The schools are not big enough to take all the extra pupils. The village would lose its facility for the annual show, and it's could possibly cause flooding The village does not need 35 houses. In fill would be quick quite sufficient and this plot is not on the village boundary according to your map.	Site IP011 was not included as a preferred options site
PO4703	Mr & Mrs J & F Mundy				Object	IP011 - SMDC. Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan – April 2016 We	Site IP011 was not included as a preferred options site

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee comments	Officer response
						attended a very well organised and well supported meeting at the Village Hall in Ipstones. The depth of feeling against the proposed development at Church Lane was demonstrated by a unanimous vote “against” the proposal by people present. By this time you are probably aware of the details discussed at the meeting. Something not discussed however was how the elected minorities seek to impose their will on the majorities they respect – what happened to democracy? On Channel 4 Radio, on Sunday the 12th June a very significant statement was made by Roger Screwton of the Princes Foundation. He said development of areas scheduled for house building was already decided when residents were informed true or not? The land scheduled for building new houses no 15 IP011 is agricultural land, owned by a farmer and presumably stored for cattle feed. The entrance to Church Lane from the High Street is circled by a one stop shop, a butcher and a public house, all of which take regular delivery vehicles in large delivery trucks. There are times when it is very difficult to turn into Church Lane from the High Street (there is a bus stop and the dropping off of school children) One can imagine the situation if as stated 35 much more cars (possible many more) will add to further congestion. Heaven help anyone who needs the ambulance or fire engine in an emergency. Ipstones is a village, not a dormitory town. Every year there is a long standing agricultural show guess where everyone parks their vehicles on this occasion No 15 IP011.	
PO4458	Mr Stephen Davis	Ivy Architectural Services Ltd			Object	Email submitted by agent Stephen Davies promoting site IP014A from summer 2015 Options consultation for housing, ahead of Preferred Option IP019. [See email attached]	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council’s website. - Environment Agency raised an issue regarding potential contamination due to historic landfill, may impact on site viability. - Highway Authority concerned about pedestrian access to the village would need to be demonstrated this could be provided.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1464	Mrs Margaret Haywood				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the proposed new housing adjoining the barn field est in Kingsley. Extra Traffic that a further 35 houses will bring to the estate will add to the danger posed to the children living there, Morton Ave is not suitable for up to 70 extra cars already they can only pose a serious problem to the residents. I strongly object to the area losing its green belt status just to accommodate the proposed new housing. Brownfield sites must be utilised before eroding green belt sites. New houses are usually purchased by young families, Kingsley St Werburghs School is full to capacity and the lack of facilities in the village adds to the problem. Kingsley has no shops, no capacity and the lack of facilities adds to the problem. Kingsley has no shops, no youth clubs, or anything for the youth of today. I appreciate there is a housing problem in the UK but in my opinion if each country built a new town complete with infrastructure that is geared up to support the town shops schools and drs etc. then that would be far better answer	• The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. They consider development is acceptable subject to access design and visibility. Impact on Moreton Avenue would need to be considered. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site was moderate. It found “<i>Development would intrude into open countryside, creating a new settlement edge on land where there is no clear outer boundary. However, Cheadle Road leading to the Dams is a strong eastern boundary and the single field is reasonably well contained visually. Significant boundary treatment would be required.</i>” Considered the site was suitable for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children’s play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO1092	Mr I Hough				Object	Moreton avenues only wide enough to just allow passage of 2 cars all or most of the houses park in the road (not enough room for 2 cars) making extra traffic proposed by the plan will make the road very dangerous. Access to A52 from Barnfields lane is difficult and will be dangerous is difficult and dangerous with extra traffic. Suggest relocating the plan to off Holt Lane where access is good either at the back of the old rectory.	- See response to PO1464 regarding highways - The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO1415	Mr I Hough				Object	Moreton Avenue is not wide enough for cars to pass with cars parked outside houses at the present. Having more houses would make this situation worse for all – emergency services, cars trying to get out and Wood Close and Rushton Ave, pedestrian's particular children – the safety aspect of alone the increased traffic is traffic is very worrying – getting in and out of the estate is already difficult and dangerous. (Thoroughfare for Alton Towers traffic) adding to the traffic would be even more dangerous.	See response to PO1464 regarding highways
PO1326	Mr JT Wells				Object	My wife and I are totally devastated to learn the favoured site for development of the Barnfield estate on Moreton Avenue, Kingsley. We	See response to PO1464 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						live on Ainsworth Avenue, which backs onto the proposed site. When we purchase our bungalow, there would be no further development in this area, it been green belt. My wife has debilitating illness called PSP progressive Supra Nuclear Pals this is a form of Parkinson disease of which there is no medication for and doesn't responds well to any treatment. She is unable to do to any tasks what so ever and relies on me to get her through the days and nights. She spends most of her days sat in the conservatory at the back, overlooking the proposed site. She also like to see the traffic on the A52 passing the Bulls Head Public House which is in full view from our conservatory. To build on this land would totally destroy our only bit off pleasure she has in life. Also the wildlife? We have no objections to any of the proposed sites. If you have to build houses in Kingsley why not consider Hazles Cross Road. To build there would not interfere with any ones privacy. Houses could be built on both sides of the road. All would have excellent views of the surrounding countryside. So in asking you please reconsider this matter	- See response to PO1092 regarding alternative sites - The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that - Loss of view is not a material planning considerations. - Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application
PO971	Mr C Fowler				Object	Why are these houses being built on a Greenfield site In Kingsley, Who are they for who will be buying them? What about excess traffic in an already over used road?	- See response to PO1464 regarding highways - There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO1624	Mr John Steele				Object	The careful consideration of Kingsley Parish Council which indicated a number of small developments within and just without the existing village boundary has been ignored in favour of one large development on the Green Belt KG049A. This is unacceptable to the residents of Kingsley on the following grounds: a) Poor access via Moreton Avenue and Barnfields Lane which are narrow, obstructed by legally parked vehicles and frequented by children playing in their quiet residential environment. b) The acknowledged hazardous issue from Barnfields Lane onto the A52. Cheadle Police are already active in trying to improve visibility problems due to parked cars in this part of Kingsley. c) There are no special circumstances which justify development on this part of the Green Belt. The proposal does not smooth the outline of the village boundary, it makes it more irregular. Overall SMDC would do well to adopt the Kingsley Parish Council proposal as the residents are not against new houses. However Kingsley already has more than it's share of lower end property in the form of Housing Association dwellings, so it would be well to encourage home owners who seek a proper integration into the village and who would contribute to village activity.	- See response to PO1464 regarding highways and Green Belt - Views have been sought as part of the consultation. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. - See response to PO971 regarding the need for site allocations
PO1619	Ms Linda Salmon				Object	I wish to object strongly to the above development: This is a very large extension of approximately 35 houses to the barnfields estate on a	See response to PO1464 regarding Green Belt, highways and infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						large piece of Greenbelt farmland with well used footpaths crisscrossing it with lots of wildlife including hares, pheasants, water vole and the great crested newt living on it or nearby. The access is off the main A52 near a dangerous bend, this is a very busy road with Alton Towers, quarry, tourist and local traffic, which is already congested with parked cars so a possibility of at least another 60 cars is frightening. In the last few years we have lost 5 shops 4 pubs and our post office. The shops and post office having been turned into houses, two pubs going the same way and the Plough on Holt Lane and its carpark being turned into a small housing development, this was a great loss to our village as the landlord aloud parents to use the carpark when dropping off and picking up children from St Werburghs primary school opposite, now you take you life in your hands negotiating this area at school times. Also speaking of the school having spoken to parents and members of staff i have been made aware that it is full to capacity is there any evidence that the arrival of further children would be catered for. The last pub closed this year partly because of a house being built on the carpark. Also there are plenty of houses for sale and to let in the village at the moment so have you surveyed who is going to want to live here? There has never been any thought or reason put into many planning aspects to our once thriving village where I have lived for the past 30 or so years, local people are moving out as it has no amenities. This development would be the final nail in Kingsleys coffin. Also I would like to know why these plans were not on show in Kingsley it being such a significant development that will affect everyone in our village?	• See response to PO1326 regarding wildlife • The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change. • The consultation documents were available for view on the Councils website and in Council Offices and libraries
PO1445	Mrs J Dono				Object	In my opinion you have not taken into consideration up to date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of Kinsley village. There are no shops of any kind, 9with no suitable premises to rent) there is no village community pubs and no facilities for our children or young adults. St Werburg's primary school is full to capacity and the areas surrounding the village offer few job/career prospects. If houses were built on a already busy through road my biggest concern is the health and safety aspect for children, pedestrians and car owners if access was along Moreton avenue. The current houses were built over 40 years ago when most families had 1 car however families have 2,3 or 4 cars making parking more difficult as cars parked on the road through the village from bottom of the green up through the high street is very busy route for heavy haulage, buses to Alton towers traffic. Adding further traffic will only increase the safety issues. I understand that is a proposed to change the status off the current green belt land to accommodate the building of 35 new homes. I believe that the green belt land cannot be changed only in exceptional circumstances. There are other sites within Kingsley- the area around the youth club along Holt lane and the field opposite which I understand is owned by the Diocese of Lichfield who wish to sell this land. If houses were built in this location there is ample opportunity to make the access roads wider and also increase the width of the road in How Lane. I am objecting to the proposed building of houses within Kinsley because the village	• See response to PO1464 regarding infrastructure, Green Belt and highways • See response to PO1092 regarding alternative sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						infrastructure cannot cope with additional homes. There no facility or plans for any, the main road is not suitable to take additional traffic due to the width and layout there are significant landscape and environmental impacts residents In the village wish to keep the green belt land that we have I will also be emailing my objections to the Kingsley parish councillor Ivor Lucas	
PO1440	Mrs J Dono				Object	I would like to register my opposition to the new proposed housing adjoining to the Barnfield Est in Kinsley. Extra traffic that a further 35 homes will bring to the estate will add a danger posed to the children living there. Moreton Avenue is not suitable for 70 extra vehicles that the new houses will generate. The extra volume of traffic and the amount of cars already there can pose serious problems for the residents. I strongly object to the area losing the greenbelt status just to accommodate the proposed new housing. Brownfield sites must be utilised before eroding greenbelt sites. New houses are usually purchased by young families, Kingsleys St Werburghs School is full to capacity and the lack of facilities in the village adds to a problem. Kingsley has no shops, no youth clubs, or anything for the youth of others. Over the past few years Kingsley has had numerous new houses built in it, each time taking away the vital space that had previously been used for parking. I appreciate there is a housing shortage in the UK but in my opinion if each time we Country built a new town with infrastructure that is geared up to support the town the schools the shops dr etc. then that would be a far better answer than keep adding to the villages that just plainly	See response to PO1464 regarding infrastructure, Green Belt and highways
PO1417	Mrs K Thorley					Green belt land Village Infrastructure Traffic congestion/health and safety issues. Environment Conservation Pubic right of way footpath/heritage significance	- See response to PO1464 regarding infrastructure, Green Belt and highways - Any development will need to be in accord with Local Plan polices regarding Heritage Assets - Existing public footpaths will be maintained or where appropriate redirected
PO1416	Mr c Thorley				Object	I strongly object to this proposal due to the fact that I brought this house because of the views and now you want to ruin that. Barnfields estate will not take any more extra traffic and this will cause uproar on our roads. Since you decided to build we notice the new street lighting, pot holes, being repaired and new road surface on the A52 from Kingsley Moor to Barnfield Lane, we also saw the counting of cars using the Barnfields Road but that was a school half term (how appropriate)	- See response to PO1464 regarding highways - See response to PO1326 regarding loss of view
PO1466	Mr S Sinclair				Object	Having seen the consultation plans at Cheadle Library I note that your preferred site for housing development plan in kingsley is behind the field behind the above address after all. My original objection to this draft proposed last year still apply and I enclose further copy of these objections. Nothing has changed to make the site any more acceptable. Last July I mentioned that we already had 2power cuts without any extra houses being there to supply. We had 2 more after July. The	- See response to PO1464 regarding highways, infrastructure - See response to PO1326 regarding residential amenity and loss of views - Loss of property value is not a material planning consideration

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						access needs roads of Moreton Ave and Cheadle are not only inadequate for construction traffic but are totally inadequate for extra traffic. I had to go to a Leek to find a Dentist as there are none in Cheadle. Where will the new occupants of the new houses go? My view and privacy will all be gone, a high fence and will block the sunlight out from my 1 flower bed. The value of my property has been blighted by this proposed to development which will force me out of my home in any event.	
PO1465	Mr K Shaw				Object	My wife and I are totally devastated to learn the favoured site for development of the Barnfield estate on Moreton Avenue, Kingsley. We live on Ainsworth Avenue, which backs onto the proposed site. When we purchase our bungalow, there would be no further development in this area, it been green belt. My wife has debilitating illness called PSP progressive Supra Nuclear Pals this is a form of Parkinson disease of which there is no medication for and doesn't respond well to any treatment. She is unable to do any tasks what so ever and relies on me to get her through the days and nights. She spends most of her days sat in the conservatory at the back, overlooking the proposed site. She also like to see the traffic on the A52 passing the Bulls Head Public House which is in full view from our conservatory. To build on this land would totally destroy our only bit of pleasure she has in life. Also the wildlife? We have no objections to any of the proposed sites. If you have to build houses in Kingsley why not consider Hazels Cross Road. To build there would not interfere with any ones privacy. Houses could be built on both sides of the road. All would have excellent views of the surrounding countryside. So in asking you please reconsider this matter	• See response to PO 1326 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO1464 regarding Green Belt
PO9432	Mr Russel Bevan				Object	Email with attached letter submitted on 13/06/16 objecting to preferred options site KG049A: 1. Loss of amenity through loss of privacy and overlooking. 2. Green Belt encroachment. 3. Wider context.	• See response to PO 1326 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO1464 regarding Green Belt

Also received a petition 184 signatures

- Green Belt site
- Village infrastructure
- Traffic congestion/health & safety issues
- Environment flooding on field/contamination from building work
- Conservation (biodiversity)
- Right of way footpath/heritage significance
- General comments- Brownfield sites in Stoke
- Need to maintain green space

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO562	Mrs Margaret May				Object	Longsdon We wish the site we put forward be reconsidered as potential infill area in the light of the proposal from the Longsdon Parish Council that the infill boundary be extended to include Micklea Lane. We submitted this site in September 2015 and it was rejected because it was not within what you had defined as the Spine of the village. The site is half an acre of the garden of High View, Micklea Lane, Longsdon. As we explained this is half the garden area. We have been trying to sell our bungalow for a year now, with two different agents and nobody wants to take on such a large garden with slopes. We are now going to sell the property without this area of land and believe the building of a suitable property to be the best solution for the unwanted garden.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.
PO969 6	Mr David Edge	Demon Pension Fund	Mr Craig Barks	Bagshaws	Object	Promoting ribbons of land at Longsdon (SHLAA form and map submitted, attached): The site gives opportunity to develop a small housing development with each property have access onto either School Lane or the A53. The land has residential development on both sides and is within easy reach of local services and infrastructure. Route of the gas main will need to be excluded, however this provides access to the land behind. Availability of the site - with 5 years , 6-10 years and 11-15 years. Availability of utilities and services within the locality. Available means of access into the site f rom School Lane and the A53 main road.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.
PO967 5	Mr David Edge	Demon Pension Fund	Mr Craig Barks	Bagshaws	Object	Promoting parcel of land at Longsdon (SHLAA form and map submitted, attached): The site gives opportunity to develop a housing development with access available from two roads. The land has residential development on both sides and is within easy reach of local services and infrastructure. Route of the gas main will need to be excluded, however could form part of the site access. Availability of site - with 5 years , 6-10 years and 11-15 years. Available means of access into the site f rom School Lane and the A53 main road. Availability of utilities and services in the locality.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Address	Post Town	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO196	Mr David Cross	1 The Gables, Rudyard, ST13 8RN	Rudyard				Object	RU016 / RU020 Both these sites are within the greenbelt and should not be built on. Rudyard additionally is important to the area due to the tourism that it generates. This should be protected. Building on these sites would be detrimental to tourism. SMDC is consulting on Rudyard being a conservation area due its special architectural and historic interest, which should be preserved and enhanced. RU016 - There is suggestion that access to this site would be via The Drive. As stated, The Drive is a private, unadopted road, which is of a rough, potholed nature. The agreement of the residents of The Drive, to the making good of this road, cannot be taken for granted, and may be actively opposed. Even if the road is made good, it is unlikely to be suitable for the traffic associated with 13 dwellings. RU020 - due to the elevated nature of this land in relation to Rudyard Road, the only obvious access is via the current access to Lakeland Lodge next to the roundabout in the village. The traffic associated with a further 14 dwellings would be substantial, and possibly cause for concern joining an already busy junction.	There are no allocations proposed in Rudyard

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Comment
PO9319	Mr David Edge	Demon Pension Fund	Mr Craig Bark	Bagshaws	Object	(Summary only - full documents attached) New Site at Stanley Moor Promoting a parcel of land at Stanley Moor, Stockton Brook (map and SHLAA form attached). Site is in Green Belt, agricultural land, grassland with no ecological features, have available access from Stanley Road and Clewllows Bank and is available within 5 years. The site gives an opportunity to develop a substantial number of residential properties in a central village location. There is residential development opposite the site fronting both roads and therefore suited to development. The site is within easy reach of local services and infrastructure.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages. Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan. The Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages. Limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.
PO9312	Mr David Edge	Demon Pension Fund	Mr Craig Bark	Bagshaws	Object	(Summary only - full documents attached) New Site at Stanley Moor Promoting 3 parcels of land at Clewllows Bank and Stanley Road, Stockton Brook (map and SHLAA form attached). Sites are in Green Belt, agricultural land, grassland with no ecological features, have available access from Stanley Road and Clewllows Bank and are available within 5 years. The three sites give opportunity to develop a small number of residential properties in a central village location. There is residential development opposite the site fronting both roads and therefore suited to development. Development of each area would mirror the residential development on the opposite side of the road and therefore give balanced small scale developments.	See above
PO9327	Mr David Edge	Demon Pension Fund	Mr Rob Ford		Object	(Summary only - full documents attached) New Sites at Stanley Moor Promoting parcels of land at Stanley Moor, Stockton Brook (map and SHLAA form attached). Consider that a total of 15 family houses could be accommodated on the sites. Adjacent land within the same ownership would remain in agricultural use. There is good vehicular access to the sites and they all face built development on the opposite side of the street and as such the proposals represent a rational reinforcement of the settlement core. They are available within 5 years.	See above

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
UT012								
PO12	Mr Paul Quinton				UT012	General comment	On your Plans for Upper Tean you indicate a preferred site for new Housing. Does this mean that you will be abandoning the Planning application on Tenford Lane leading to Clarendon Park?	This site has planning approval for residential development.
PO1370	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			UT012	Object	Map 4.44 - Upper Tean - housing allocation site UT012 - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation has been assessed in respect of the Grade II Anchor Inn and any unknown archaeology in relation to the former mill site. Further information is required.	See response to PO12.
PO1250	Mr Martin Broadhurst				UT012	Object	Roads are too busy already esp the cross roads (Teanford Lane) Nothing to offer children here, little amenities schools oversubscribed. Flood Plains people who do buy will find out there are other sites to build on in other areas	See response to PO12.
PO1251	Miss J Heath				UT012	Object	Concern re large quantity of planned dwellings due to flood risk and over population of rural area	See response to PO12.
PO1252	Mr JM Cotgreave				UT012	General comment	My house on Willow Close back onto a flood plain, and I must remind you on no account can you build anything whatsoever on it or by it. It does flood and I mean flood	See response to PO12.
PO1254	Miss L webberley				UT012	Object	This proposed development seems rather large with no additional amenities to support and would be built next to a river on a flood plain land which has proved to be a costly mistake in the other areas of the country over recent years surely there must be another brownfields site within Cheadle or close by which could better support this development	See response to PO12.
PO1123	Mr C Trumper				UT012	Object	UT012 The site by the Hope and Anchor public house is completely the opposite to UT019 as it is spreading the village out and owners are just as likely to shop locally in Cheadle as Tean as the car will have to be used due to the distance away from shops, schools and amenities.	See response to PO12.
PO2707	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			UT012	Object	UT012 in Upper Tean is heavily impacted by Flood Risk. As well as the main river to the west, there is a smaller channel parallel to it within the site that will need to be modelled. Easements and/or floodplain may mean nothing can be developed between the main river and the smaller channel. We would question this site passing the sequential test and a Level 2 SFRA would be necessary if it did.	See response to PO12.
PO2890	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			UT012	Object	UT012 is located on an area identified as water vole habitat. Given the extreme rarity of this protected species of principal importance consultation with Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and water vole survey is required prior to allocation of this site. Should allocation affect water vole habitat full mitigation of impacts will be required.	See response to PO12.
UT019								
PO1371	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			UT019	Object	Map 4.44 - Upper Tean - housing allocation site UT019 - It is not clear how the impact of the site allocation has been assessed in relation to the Upper Tean Conservation Area. Further information is required.	- The site is located within a Conservation Area. There are two Grade II* and ten Grade II Listed Buildings within the 400m buffer. - The Council's Landscape, Green Space and

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
								Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Heritage Assessment for this site which advises that the site is currently used as a work yard which adversely affects the character of the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings. Sensitive development could enhance the Conservation Area. Mitigation including vegetation screening along the southern boundary would reduce effects to the settings of the Listed Buildings. Development would be unlikely to cause adversely effects to the HLC zone UTHECZ 3 (Historic Environment Character Assessment 2010) and the Site is suitable for development in heritage terms with appropriate masterplanning.
PO1122	Mr C Trumper				UT019	Support	UT019 Within Tean quite logically the brown site in the village if developed for housing would remove industry from its centre which would only benefit the village. There would be more local trade for the local amenities and the schools and medical facilities are within very easy walking distance so would not increase local traffic on the school runs etc.	Support noted.
PO2822	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			UT019	General comment	This site appears to be Brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2041	Mr J Camwell				Object	The crofted mill off Cheadle Road upper tean, that mill was stated in the late 1600 as dye work, for the Philips family so all the building is listed, I ask you this. In 1970's they pull down some building which were listed and nothing wrong with them. APC gas took over and had them pulled down. Isn't a protection order on a listed building his son got the mill now. I do understand that Mr Adcock's land comes under the Cheadle Ward. Please put a stop to the building in the countryside.	Comments noted. This site has not been identified as a preferred option housing site.
PO1121	Dr N.J. Wright				Object	I am raising my objections to proposed Housing Development Sites UT041 and UT018 in Upper Tean. Both these sites are accessed by rural single track roads. This is not clear from the map which gives a false impression of the roads around these proposed sites. It is in my view imperative that any sites considered for housing have good road access in and out to ensure the safety and accessibility for existing and new residents. This is a rural village so most residents use motor vehicles to access schools, shops, GP surgeries and other local amenities. If the above sites were used for new housing without significant alteration to the existing roads then this would result in traffic chaos. Having examined the plans my view is that proposed sites UT022 and UT024 would be most suitable as they have good existing road access for existing and new residents. In summary: The map gives a false impression of existing roads. UT041 and UT018 are unsuitable because access roads are single track rural roads. UT022 and UT024 are most suitable because they have good access roads.	Comments noted. None of these sites have been identified as a preferred option site for housing.
PO3882	Mr Justin Philips	Heath House Events Ltd			Support	Thank you for your time this evening at the Cheadle Guildhall and your helpful comments. As discussed, I am happy for land ref UT023 to be considered for planning by Staffordshire Moorlands together with the other 3 fields to the north of it up to Gorsty Hill Road [SK0139 5856, SK0139 5273 SK0139 4394] .	- UT023 was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. - A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - Development of the 3 fields to the north is not considered appropriate development of this extent would be out of scale with the settlement and would not be well related to the existing pattern of settlement.
PO1304	Miss J Newman				General comment	I am writing to you to ask you not to build houses on Teanford Lane. I am sad and worried about this because ever since I was a age of 2-3 years old I have deeply fallen in love with the horses, and it has become a tradition to feed them whenever I am out at my nanas house. One of my worries is that if you move the horses, my nana will have too many carrots in her fridge, as there will be no horses to feed. I am strongly	No sites are proposed on Teanford Lane in the Local Plan. Planning permission has been granted for residential development.

Upper Tean

Question 41 – Do you have any other comments regarding the Rural Areas?

						against moving horses from their home and disrupting their lives. Also I have grown so close to the horses, and have grown so close to them I have named them as such, Peggy, Chocolate and many more names. My sister and I hope you will not destroy their home. I hope you will take this into account and address this matter immediately.	
PO3873	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Support	This submission is made in support of the allocation of site option UT041 in Upper Tean for housing development [5 attachments are attached].	- The site was previously included in the Site Options consultation 2015 and was not taken forward. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. - A planning application has been submitted for development on this site.
PO1306	Miss E Newman				General comment	I am deeply troubled by the idea that the fields located in Staffordshire Moorlands are going to be destroyed and to be built over. One of my main concerns for the fields on Teanford Lane is that there are horses which are very friendly and live on this field. Therefore, I strongly believe that the horses it would be both unfair and cruel to move them from their homes to be relocated elsewhere. Not only that my sister and I both have a passion for both horses and riding. As a result whenever I come to visit my grandparents in Stoke we feed the horses. We have done this every time we come over and it has become a tradition. Consequently it would upset us both deeply if you took this tradition of us just for the sake of a few houses	No sites are proposed on Tenford Lane in the Local Plan. Planning permission has been granted for residential development.

Waterhouses

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Site Reference	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO2827	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			WA004	General comment	WA004: This site appears to be Brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	The preferred options mixed use allocation includes the existing employment site. The rest of the site is greenfield.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2556	Mr J Buxton	Waterhouses Parish Council			Object	SUMMARY - FULL COMMENTS ATTACHED Concerned about criteria used to categorise Waterhouses as a larger village. Consider data is flawed. Should be considered as a smaller village. Request clarification regarding population statistics and overlap with the part of the villages that falls within the Peak District National Park. Consider that proportion allocated to Waterhouses is excessive compared to its size. object to loss of existing industrial units on site WA004 – provides opportunity for local businesses and employment. Do not wish to see village boundary extended. Request a meeting to discuss.	- The adopted Core Strategy defines the list of larger and smaller villages. Appendix J Village Assessment, indicates the estimated village population and facilities and services supporting the village. Waterhouses has a good range of services and facilities including a primary school, doctors surgery, shop, post office and community centre. The village population includes houses within the Peak District National Park (PDNP) boundary considered to be part of the village. Population is not the determining factor as to whether a settlement is defined as a 'larger' or 'smaller' village and Waterhouses is considered to provide an important service centre on the eastern edge of the district and on the edge of the PDNP. - Site WA004 is a mixed use allocation and includes the re-provision of employment within the site. Agreed that this provides an opportunity for local businesses and employment. - The preferred option site WA004 is located within the 1998 Local Plan village boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO53	Mr Wiggins				Object	Although building directly behind me will not affect me directly it will have an affect on any wildlife that currently enjoys an area that is both wild and unkempt. ..as I understand the is also the possibility of the underground well if disturbed affecting the current surrounding dwellings	The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations ,the Local Wildlife Assessment (2017) assessed sites to establish their potential SBI/BAS status against Staffordshire Wildlife Trust criteria They found that the site had mostly low biodiversity value overall with the exception of the trees which may have the potential to support roosting bats and recommended that a bat survey was carried out
PO95	Mr Nick Simpson				Object	As a resident of Salters Close Im concerned about the proposed development. My property at the rear would loose all it's privacy as I would be looked down from the new builds. Also the new builds would be looked down on from the current houses from the main road. Poor access would also be dangerous as its a very busy road & close to busy junction. The proximity to the prison is ridiculous. My house was built for prison worker as a I knew when I moved here. The prison as grown over the years & so' as the noise it emits. By noise in mean CONSTANT bad language & threats of violance towards inmates. I hear this ALL the time, evenings & weekends when out in my garden. The prison does employ local staff & it should not have to accommodate housing issues been built any closer to it.	- Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application - The Highway Authority has expressed concerns about site access which require consideration to determine whether a solution is possible - Any development of this site would be required to submit a noise impact assessment to consider the effect of the YOI and any mitigation measures. - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding pollution which includes noise.
PO1161	Mrs J Fryer				Object	As a Parish Councillor and resident of Werrington for 44 years I have to object to your proposals to develop site WE003. Officers making these decisions, who do not reside in this area, should listen to local people who do. Site WE003 is a greenbelt area with outstanding vistas which residents greatly value. At a public consultation meeting in 2015 an alternative site was put forward (land off the bottom of Ash Bank Rd, A52) with no real views but officers threw this out as it was on greenbelt land! This dichotomy needs addressing. Site WE003 would result in much more traffic joining the A52 at a point which would make an already dangerous route into the city even more dangerous	The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						particularly for children using the local primary school. We lost the school crossing person on the A52 years ago. Other alternative sites were suggested by residents and these have also been rejected. These were 'infill' sites at the top of Hillside Rd, which is seldom used and then only as a 'short cut' and land off Radley Way which is used for the same purpose. I believe the views of residents should hold more sway than SMDC officers who have no idea of the geography of the area except on paper. Werrington residents deserve greater consideration than they are being offered at the moment. We know more houses have to be built (?) but we know where they SHOULD be built. Please listen to us. We will continue to resist inappropriate developments including a Traveller's Site which I have been informed could be put back into consideration.	development on the site on Green Belt purposes moderate. It recommends considering site WE003 for release from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances with the northern part of the site being open space to preserve its openness. The capacity of this site has been lowered from 85 to 50 dwellings to take this into account. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. • The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy • See response to PO95 regarding highways
PO1437	Mrs J Hodgetts				Object	Regarding the proposed housing on WE003, I would like to bring this to your attention my concerns – The noise from the street now is so noisy and starts at 6am until early hours. So much traffic, can homes etc. be supplied from the supermarket are so big and heavy. Being near the roads and traffic lights make it worse, stopping and starting etc. from four areas. Not able open	• See response to PO95 regarding noise and highways • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						our windows in our front bedroom windows for fresh air because of the noise and pollution from the petrol fumes. Also the youth offending detention centre so close, they shout from there windows to each other rows outside, the echoes of that disturbing and at times unbearable to relax. Would you like to live in this development, would other people add to this situation? No safe entrance only by the detention centre	assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO1384	Mrs Christine Meyrick				General comment	As a resident (i have lived in the area for 45years) I wish to object most strongly to the preferred site' WE003 for Werrington + Cellarhead . The parish council in the 2015 consultation suggested another site lower down Ash Bank with better access to the A52 why has this not been looked at? Why has this not been looked at? The preferred Site' will have upwards of 100 cars coming out onto the a52 at the top of a dangerous hill and close to the traffic lights where it is always congested. There are local builders who have been refused for a why? Officers should listen to the residents the schools and the surgeries are already oversubscribed. The site on a wet morning when the children are being taken to school by car, it is gridlocked.	- See response to PO95 regarding highways - See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO1432	Miss B Jack				Object	Response letter submitted [attached]: Object to development of site WE003 for the following reasons: Close proximity to HMYOI site. The anti-social impact of the prison should be taken into consideration, prior to any decision being made on the land. Have the council even considered how dangerous and inappropriate it is close to an institution such as HMYOI Werrington. Local residents currently face anti-social behaviours from the in mates at HMYOI often swearing and shouting till late into the night. Also drug dealing in the field to take the drug up to the prison fences, this has been reported to the police. Poor access onto A52 - Staffordshire County Council acknowledges that this site presents highways problems because it is situated on a busy main road on the brow of a hill. Given that building on WE003 gives the highways concern from a point of entry and that it is already a very busy road surely given that is also in close proximity to a school and bus stops both below and above by the local post office surely this will cause congestion that is already an issue. Infrastructure – Schools – Already oversubscribed schools. Schools some distance away increased car journeys required. A52 very dangerous especially around Washerwall Lane junction. Infrastructure – Other – doctors and dentists already at capacity. Few services in Werrington have to use car to go to other areas shops/schools etc. Demand on local churches. Where are the jobs to support increased population. Landscape – area is greenbelt and inappropriate use Greenbelt review should be undertaken and recommendations taken into account. Do not destroy our countryside. Openness of land should be preserved. Visual impact on landscape and SLA and historic park lands. View of area is wonderful. SCC has produced	- See response to PO95 regarding noise, residential amenity and highways - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - An assessment of the District's

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						a historic environment assessment for area. This document describes the heritage values of the landscape as of high historical value, high aesthetic and high evidential value. This document recommends 'there is little capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the historic landscape character.' Field retains historic hedgerows. Long distance views of Derbyshire and Wem Nature Conservation – natural habitat will be ruined for a wide range of wildlife including pond life. Since the closure of the Werrington prison community pathway this is now over grown and has become a haven for a variety of wildlife and gives a sense of country to what is a beautiful village. Land available and proposed in better areas should therefore be used. WE003 is full of wildlife many of the mature trees surrounding the site are inhabited by bats and many bird species - conserve and enhance biodiversity not destroy it. Flood Risk – land is boggy developing here could cause flooding elsewhere. Could create artificial flood plain on clay land. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – loss of privacy, views and amenity. In the comment made by the council in response to the consultation made last summer it states that amenity issues will be assessed in detail once the site has been laid out and planning application has been received. Surely when deciding if a site should be taken into consideration at the current time as this determines whether this land is suitable or not? i.e. if the land is substantially elevated regardless of the type of development residents will be overlooked and their privacy rights shall be affected. Impact of noise, disturbance, overlooking and overshadowing. Scale of development – potential to increase housing numbers in future as field large. Eradicate village status. It would be a shame that so near to the cenotaph that represents our war hero's could face constant traffic coming and going across from it when for years it as been a peaceful place to go and reflect on those we have lost to war. Ash Bank Road strong settlement boundary line. 50 dwellings is out of character with the open nature. Impact on Human Rights – see caselaw - (Bovis Homes Limited v New Forest District Council ADMN 2002 (2202) EWHC 483 "Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic wellbeing of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. In the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposed delivery of circa 50 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect on the area, however the site is inaccessible to areas of existing employment, which would have a significant negative effect. Similarly, the sites inaccessibility to services and facilities and areas of open space is likely to have a negative	employment land requirements was carried out in The Employment Land Requirement Study the draft Local Plan proposes employment allocations/policies to meet this need • See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape and heritage impacts of the development allocations. It found the site was suitable for development in heritage terms. It was of medium landscape sensitivity. It recognised the site forms a gap with the existing development and fits well within the existing settlement pattern. It recommended landscape mitigation on the south-eastern and southern boundaries • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • Any development will need to take account of the Cenotaph and the policies in the Local Plan regarding heritage assets • The local plan process is being followed is in accordance with the national planning policy

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						affect. Also, the sites district ecological importance is likely to have a negative affect, as could the development of greenfield grade 4 ALC land and the sites proximity to historic assets is assessed as having a negative effect.	
PO1442	Mr Spencer Hodgetts				Object	I am writing to oppose the above on environmental grounds. My wife and I moved into 386 Ash Bank during 8//2005. At this time behind our property there was a concrete lined footpath (leading to the detention centre) and simple wooden fence wildlife appeared to be very light. In the 11 years since we moved in we have trained a thick hedge along the fence line. The concrete path now has a leaf and mould covering – to form a substantial wildlife corridor. Subsequently y house sparrow, and starlings numbers both decline species have shown large increases in decline because of the fatal viruses) have shown a large no increase in gold finch, bull finch, and very recently green finches now regularly attend our garden feeders. The natural wildlife corridor the old walkway now supports several hedgehogs would quickly reverse. To build on this developing wildlife corridor would very quickly reverse – the encouraging recovery. As an alternative site – pls look again at in fill, perhaps along the lower end of ash bank where there is a clear gap/right hand side before brook house lane to complete this ribbon	• See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO1212	Miss Samantha Simpson				Object	I wish to express my opinions on the development of area WE003. The development on the land here will not be sustainable for residents of Werrington Village. Those most affected will be living on Salters Close. The residents of Salters Close already have to deal with the chaotic foul language of which is bellowed by the inmates of Her Majesty's Youth Detention Center. They can be heard most nights and is more of a problem in the summer as it can ruin perfectly nice evenings sitting outside in the garden. The houses being built will be closer to the prison so the foul language will be louder and clearer. This is not ideal to young families who I believe are the target audience for these new houses. It immoral for young children to be brought up with this kind of language and behaviour so close to their homes where they should feel safe and at peace. The building of houses on this area will also be eradicating the privacy of the residents on salters close as the ground of which is being proposed, is slightly elevated compared to the current land that has been built on at Salters Close. This means that those in the new houses will be able to see everything in the current residents windows and gardens. They will also have no longer a view of Greenland and countryside, which is a key factor to why lots choose to purchase houses in werrington. This urban look is often unattractive to current residents of the area and is not wanted. The removal of the field will also kill wildlife present in its own habitat. Animals such as rabbits, foxes, badgers, pheasants and birds can be seen in the field regularly and the removal of the trees will leave birds with no place to nest and no place for bats	• See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity, highways and proximity YOI • Loss of views is not a material planning consideration • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						to live in either. These types of animals can be seen regularly and are lovely to watch and take photos of, especially in the spring while they raise their young. The development here will also cause a hazard to those on the road and pedestrians. The A52 which runs next to the development area is already extremely busy and can be dangerous at the best of times. The 40mph road is fast with a long hill which can be dangerous in wet conditions, even worse with ice and snow. I personally fear more so for the young children of Werrington Primary School, many of which need to cross this road to get their education. Children may not be road aware and are at more of a risk to stepping out on the road and getting injured or potentially death. No one should want to risk this to the young children who learn here. I hope this helps you towards your final decision of where you will develop.	
PO1413	Mr T D Hughes				Object	After residing in Werrington for over 40years I would like to make a strong objection to the above planning proposal. The panoramic views overlooking green belt and that I and my late wife have enjoyed over the year will disappear, and what will become of the wildlife sanctuary adjacent to the rear of property. Perhaps more importantly what worries me most of the time is the volume of traffic on Ashbank Road at certain times comes to a standstill, making it impossible to get out of ones driveway. In addition the local schools and off course the village surgeries are pretty much full to capacity. If Werrington expands anymore surely we will become part of Stoke on Trent and possibly lose our village status.	• See response to PO1212 regarding loss of views • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO95 regarding access • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure
PO1232	Mrs T Wiggins				Object	As a lifetime resident of Werrington I wish to express my concerns regarding the proposed site of WE003. During the last consultation and the consultation held by Werrington Parish Council it was discussed and agreed by the majority of the residents who attended the open meeting that the development of land known as WE003 was against the wishes of all residents. Alternative sites were put forward by the Parish Council and also the residents of Werrington, these sites have not been taken into consideration and in some cases have not been correctly investigated for potential development sites. I would request the officers involved in the proposed development sites regarding Werrington to actually visit the village to assess what damage would be caused by an on mass development proposal: • Greenfield Site • Close proximity to YOI site • Poor access onto site as suggested by Highways Department • Nature Staffordshire County Council acknowledges that this site presents highways problems because it is situated on a busy main road on the brow of a hill. Given that building on WE003 gives the highways concern from a point of entry and that it is already a very busy road surely given that is also in close proximity to a school and bus stops both below and above by the local post office surely this will cause congestion that is already an issue. There are many other reasons why the area marked WE003	• Residents' views have been sought as part of the consultations. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan. • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO95 regarding highways and proximity to YOI • See response to PO1432 regarding the Cenotaph • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						should not be built on, since the closure of the Werrington prison community pathway this is now over grown and as become a haven for a variety of wildlife and gives a sense of country to what is a beautiful village. Land available and proposed in better areas should therefore be used. It would be a shame that so near to the cenotaph that represents our war hero's could face constant traffic coming and going across from it when for years it as been a peaceful place to go and reflect on those we have lost to war.	
PO1433	Mr M Cooper				Object	We003 School site already over capacity built on Again over capacity dangerous turning in on the brow of the hill A place of natural beauty underground spring bat population nesting birds on ground in field Noisy, loss of privacy unspoilt being overlooked one property. Conservation area is too much not acceptable Bats birds nesting underground spring Property purchased close for its quiet location and beauty and privacy as I mention above birds and bats nesting categorically the wrong site for development. Such an incompetent decision made by small minds we shall fight this all the way, of that you can be sure. Alternative site bottom of Werrington road right hand side going down still within the moorland boundary	• See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO1205	mrs sarah tweedie				Object	I am emailing to express my concerns for development on green belt land in werrington for building housing when there are alternative areas available not to mention the sustainability of already saturated services within the community for the doctors and schools. I believe destroying this piece of land to build housing is wrong and alternative locations should be considered.	• See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure
PO851	Mr Peter Davies				Object	The WE003 site is unsuitable for additional housing for the following reasons. 1 Access, the potential access to this site is on the brow of a hill which has unsuitable visibility splays in either direction. I also understand the Highways Authority has also objected under safety grounds? 2 The traffic on the A52 is already too heavy and at rush hour times the queues are really bad and stretch all the way into the city.	• See response to PO95 regarding highways
PO1163	Ms J Morrison				Object	My name is Jocelyn Morrison and I am a former District Councillor and current Parish Councillor. I wish to object most strenuously to the proposed development of site WE003. Site WE300 is a greenbelt area with outstanding vistas which residents greatly value. The Parish Council held a public consultation meeting in 2015 where an alternative site was put forward which was land off the bottom of Ash Bank Rd, A52. This has no real views. Officers threw this out as it was on greenbelt land! I do not understand how one green belt site is acceptable and another is not! The A52 is a very busy main road. Site WE003 would result in much more traffic joining the A52 at a point which would make an already dangerous route into the city even more dangerous particularly for children using the local primary school. We lost the school crossing person on the A52 years ago. As a result of the Public Meeting other	• See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt and alternative sites • See response to PO95 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						alternative sites were suggested by residents and these have also been rejected. These were 'infill' sites at the top of Hillside Rd, which is seldom used and then only as a 'short cut' and land off Radley Way which is used for the same purpose. Officers making these decisions, who do not reside in this area, should listen to local people who do. I believe the views of residents should hold more sway than SMDC officers who have no idea of the geography of the area except on paper. Werrington residents deserve greater consideration than they are being offered at the moment. We know more houses have to be built but we know where they SHOULD be built. Please listen to us.	
PO1166	Mr and Mrs N Jack				Object	1) I am extremely concerned about the access to the site known as WE003. No access to the site currently exists and anew access road will need to be created. A road at the northern end of the site next to the HMYOI would open onto Ashbank road on the brow of a hill which when considering how busy the road is and the limited vision that drivers will have both entering and leaving the site would be considered highly dangerous as even the highway code states that you must not stop on the brow of a hill. Access to the north western area of the site would again open up onto the busy A52 near the junction of Salters Lane/Washerwall lane, this is a busy junction at the best of times but when its rush hour and the hinderance of school traffic both for the primary and high school and bus stops in both directions just passed the traffic lights the traffic is often chaotic and grdlocked. Adding a further road to this chaos would surely only make matters worse and put drivers lives at risk? 2) The councils response to last years consultation stated that "Amenity issues will be assessed in detail once a site layout..... and application has been received"- surely when deciding on whether a site is suitable and appropriate concerns of privacy; loss of light and being overlooked should be taken into consideration i.e. If the land is substantially elevated (which WE003 is) residents privacy rights will be affected regardless of what sort of development there is. The anti-social impact of the prison should be taken into consideration. Has the council considered how dangerous and inappropriate the placement of homes would be being so close to the prison. Local residents currently have issues with inmates shouting and swearing during the day and night. Also drug dealers use the surrounding fields including WE003 to take drugs to the prison fences. Many residents commented on this at a local Parish meeting held recently. 3) Questions still remain unanswered surrounding the Werrington infrastructure an its ability to cope with more demand on the areas services. The doctors, dentist and schools are full or almost full to capacity surely adequate provisions need to implemented before any form of development is considered and implemented. 4)The council states in its "obligation to Co operate" policy that working with neighbouring / bordering authorities will be	• See response to PO95 regarding highways, residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • National planning guidance states that the Council should seek to meet the development needs of their area. Housing allocations are needed to ensure the Districts housing requirement is met. • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites • The Green Belt Review recommended that site WE033 was not released from the Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						discussed, surely these discussions need to take place prior to land being released from Green belt? SOT have an abundance of brown sites only a mile or two down the road regeneration partnerships should be a priority. 5) The site WE033 at cellarhead seems to have been dropped, this seems strange as the land has recently started to be developed (3 houses built in the last 12 months), the land owner is known locally as keen to proceed with further development however the council have decided to mark the site as "constrained" even though it is safer and easier to access has this been overlooked by the council as it seems a bit ridiculous to remove something that has already been started?	
PO1168	Mr and Mrs S Shaw				Object	Following receipt of your recent flyer regarding a proposed new development I wish to write to you and strongly object to this proposal, I feel I have a number of valid reasons why planning permission should not be granted. We live at 396 Ashbank Road which backs onto the proposed development site. We are writing to ask that you refuse the planning application based on the following reasons: 1- We purchased our property on Ashbank Road with a view to retire in a peaceful and picturesque location surrounded by countryside. When viewing this property I fell in love with the view from my back door, how could you not surrounded by lush green fields, trees and wildlife. It is our dream retirement home. Upon purchase of the property my estate agent highlighted that the view added approximately £5,000 to the value of our property. Searches carried out at the time did not suggest any potential up and coming developments. We're absolutely horrified at the prospect of potential development; I can't believe you are considering building and over ruling the green belt policy. 2- We moved here from a busy town environment and wish to retire to a semi-rural community where we can live peacefully without the hustle and bustle of others. I feel the proposed building site will take this away from us. We have worked so hard and have always dreamed of living in a place like this. It really is a lovely quiet little village. 3- Currently we are not over looked and no one can see into our garden. The proposed site is an invasion of privacy and will definitely impact on the peaceful surroundings of our home, not to mention the adjoining properties. We feel the mass, bulk and proximity of the proposed development would present an overbearing and intrusive element to us and the neighbouring properties. The development is inappropriate for a Green Belt area and feel it has a harmful impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of this Green Belt land. 4- The village is currently at capacity with an over subscribed school and a GP surgery with an appointment wait time of approx 2 weeks. What would another 40 households do to these already over stretched facilities? 5- If plans are granted and work is to commence I dread to think of the noise and pollution the building work will cause. This would also be visually over baring and make living in my home very	• See response to PO1212 regarding loss of views • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • Loss of property value is not a material planning consideration • See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						uncomfortable. 6- We live approximately 300 meters from Werrington Young Offenders Institute. On a daily basis when inmates are being exercised we hear inmates shouting and goading each other. Some of their use of language is colorful and am not sure this site is appropriate for developing a new estate where potential young families will be living. 7- We have a considerable amount of wildlife living within this green belt area and feel that there has been no consideration regarding this! Numerous surveyors have been to scope out the land but what will happen to the wildlife and habitats that surround? Have you considered this? We invite you to visit our home to verify that these objections are valid. Therefore, we ask Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to refuse this Planning Application and encourage it to be moved to a more suitable site within the Staffordshire Moorlands area.	
PO1170	Mr H Weston					These developments would have a monumental impact on the village. Ash bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside school. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which includes HGV's, Buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington's population is largely made up of older residents more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the Green Belt and on Wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of Natural Beauty with an abundance of Wildlife and feel this needs to be protected. Infill Building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the Green Belt and Village status.	• See response to PO95 regarding highways and proximity to YOI • See response to POPO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt and alternative sites
PO1177	Ms J Forster				Object	I have just attended a local residents /parish council meeting tonight to discuss the proposed development of 111 houses in Werrington. I wish to support the view put forward at the meeting, that Smdc revisit the previous sites identified and review it's proposals. In particular I object to the development at the back of Ash Bank Road. By allowing this to take place will increase the likelihood that you will allow further development along this stretch of road in the future. Congestion on the A52 is already an issue! Not to mention the greenbelt. A point was raised that the Young Offenders Institute may close in Werrington in the near future. A large area of land will become available.....	• See response to PO95 regarding highways and proximity of YOI • See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt and alternative sites
PO1183	Ms V Williams				Object	I write in reference to the preferred housing sites WE003 and WE052, I am very concerned about the access to these sites being off the A52 Ash Bank Road. Being a resident on this road, it is already difficult enough to get into or out of our drive at times due to the volume and speed of traffic that travels on it. At certain times of day this road is already congested resulting in queuing traffic trying to get into Hanley. We do not have in infrastructure to support these houses in the village, we cannot register at the dentist, it can take 3 weeks to get a drs	• See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure, employment and impact on the Cenotaph • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						appointment and the schools are already at capacity. There is not work to support the families that would move into these houses so this would mean more commuters and more congestion which would impact negatively on the existing residents. The traffic noise and pollution would increase and Ash Bank road is noisy enough as it is. We have contacted Staffordshire county council on numerous occasions about our concerns regarding the safety of the 40mph speed limit on this stretch of road as two schools are accessed from it and it is an accident waiting to happen, adding another 75 homes into this area will only make this situation worse. Our war memorial is a place where people can go and reflect and remember our war heroes, this building will have a negative effect on this area. These areas are in the greenbelt and I have seen owls hunting on the area of land WE003 we need to protect our wildlife and open spaces in order to maintain the status of our village. During times of adverse weather this area of road becomes treacherous we have regularly seen cars sliding down past HMYOI, this would be even more dangerous with another access road on the left. The safety of the children walking to and from school should be paramount and adding all this extra traffic will have a negative effect on this. I would urge you to look at the parish councils proposed sites again and take into account the views of the local residents as we are the ones who will have to live with the decision that is made. Please consider this a formal objection to these proposed sites.	
PO1186	Mr Darren Williams				Object	I absolutely object to the plans to build houses in Werrington on the A52. My drive is directly accessed from this already dangerous road and I have emailed the County Council many times about my concerns-especially the 40mph limit. The large number of schoolchildren (who are socially urged to walk more) walking on a very narrow footpath (next to the chip shop/Chinese). I urge someone to carry out this task in the flesh as a HGV hurtles past at speed, believe me it is very unnerving! There WILL be an accident, my previous emails have stated this and my concerns are documented. It is only a matter of time. So instead of addressing this and introducing speed calming measures or speed reduction, the bright idea of an additional strain on the very dangerous stretch of road, incredible. Yes, you can then reduce the speed but can you reduce the number of cars? In each direction leaving Werrington, obviously people would HAVE to travel out of the VILLAGE to work, there is severe congestion. Towards Cheadle, Weston Coyney, Leek and in particular Hanley. I see the traffic daily and avoid it if at all possible. Werrington needs traffic REDUCING, not increasing. The obvious strains on doctors, churches, dentist, facilities for young people etc. will be felt but the most interesting strain is the one on schools. Ridiculously, there is currently building work ongoing putting 30 houses where	• See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						a school used to be! These are not yet completed and the effect and impact of the extra strain on the VILLAGE hasn't yet taken effect. Less than a mile away at Cellarhead, additional "affordable housing" has been built. Most of these have yet to impact the area with additional children. Let's take the 30 houses behind Oak Mount Road, averaging 2.4 children each=132 people, approximately 60 cars. Really, this hasn't even been absorbed into the area yet. How on Earth can the VILLAGE take more and more without monitoring the effect of the already bursting population? I urge someone to queue in the traffic taking children to Moorside High School, then turn around into more traffic to queue through Werrington into Hanley. Then try the walk to school, if you dare. Please document this as an absolute formal objection to these proposals and acknowledge receipt of this prior to the deadline date.	
PO1195	Mr Paul Dean				Object	I object to anymore houses being built in Werrington - it is an act of lunacy and disrespect to the existing residents! The tensions are building up and how much more are we expected to take before matters get out of hand, you have a social responsibility towards us and make our lives bearable. My proposition would be to build an entirely new village, if we really do have to be build in the Moorlands, preferably towards the Tean and Blythe Bridge area by the A50 where there is a large road in place for ease of access and transport. This would then offer people the selection of choice of either accessing Derby and Burton-on-Trent or Stoke on Trent for retail and employment. It can be seen Stoke on Trent is failing badly and by building houses in Werrington you are isolating them from opportunities, I personally try not to set foot in Stoke-on-Trent any longer and many in the village are of the same opinion. There are far too many houses in Werrington now and this started in the 1980s with the Meigh Road estate and especially in the 1990s when you built the Hill Village Road estate. Even now they are building more houses on the old Werrington First School site, in fact they are squeezing them in, causing a grotesque eyesore - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! The junction at Washerwall Lane is not going to get any bigger and the gridlocks are a daily occurrence and this is not environmentally friendly, the pollution is getting out of hand as the road congestion increases. The A52 down into Stoke-on-Trent is not going to change and it is the same for the A53 from Leek, these roads were put in place a long time ago and there is nothing you can do to enable them to have a larger carrying capacity. Only foolish people will sit around loading data into a computer trying to come up with some solution to later find in practice it fails, this seems to be the approach they take in Stoke-on-Trent. Both the A52 and A53 are operating on maximum capacity and cannot carry anymore vehicles - have you conducted a recent traffic survey? There was no foresight back when they were built to increase capacity, so only the most ignorant of planners will	• See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1166 regarding the need for development • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure and flooding • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						attempt to try anything. Other infrastructure within Werrington is also at capacity such as the Doctors and School and we do not want any more shops or take aways being built here either! If people desire urban living they can go and live in the City - as this is a village. I am also concerned about the rising water table in the village and existing flooding problems as there are Springs everywhere, the road names Draw Well Lane and Washerwall Lane give indication of this. I see no evidence of any hydrological surveys and whether the existing drains can take anymore new builds. To build more houses in the Moorlands around the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is the wrong approach to take for future generations and we will only get sucked into the continuing failures of that City. Although there was recent talk of a boundary change and Werrington becoming a part of Stoke-on-Trent, so if you do decide to build more houses here it may be worth my time to start lobbying for a boundary change. I want to make representation and speak to somebody at the Council as soon as possible regarding this.	
PO1204	Mr Travis Simpson				Object	I wish to express my concerns with the plans proposed by Staffs Moorlands Council. I feel that there are many disadvantages to these plans and this could be costly to our local community as well as the wildlife surrounding it. One example of this is that the prisoners often make lots of noise, which even we, from Salters Close, can hear vividly. As you can expect, this language is not appropriate for anybody to hear. The houses that are proposed to be built will hear this much louder. This means that people wont be interested in living next door to a prison, thus meaning the houses will likely remain empty and a waste of council money. The proposed houses will also besmirch scenery and animals' habitat which is not worth sacrifice, especially considering that there are other places which wont ruin habitats which can still provide houses. I am also concerned that the houses will result in a lack of privacy for my family and myself. They would look directly down into my bedroom window where my bed is. I hope that you take everyone's concerns into consideration.	• See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity and proximity to YO1 • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife
PO1206	Ms Sharon Meyrick				Object	I am writing to you re plans for the proposed site WE003 in Werrington. I am a very concerned home owner of Werrington who has lived in Werrington for most of my life. The infrastructure of our village is at breaking point already, with the schools over subscribed and it is almost an impossibility to get a doctors appointment within a decent amount of time unless it is an emergency. Also the main road will struggle to cope with any more traffic pouring onto its already too busy area of the young offenders and the oakmount estate. The area proposed for the WE003 site for the 50 houses I believe to be green belt anyway so I cannot understand why it has to be built on anyway. There are more and more houses being built in and around our village of Werrington which I think is ample for our area. In short the idea	• See response to PO1432 regarding Infrastructure • See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						of the additional 50 houses to be built in that area is in my opinion ludicrous and should be scrapped.	
PO1213	Mr Steven Brown				Object	Following the receipt of the recent flier regarding the new developments I am objecting strongly to the proposals for developing the area WE003 for housing for the following reasons.... 1. I bought my current property on Ashbank Road as I wished to be by green belt land / fields / countryside and as the enclosed photo "view" shows the reason why. The estate agent said the "view" added an extra £5000 to the value for the aspect and now you are proposing to over rule green belt policy and blot the landscape by building an estate on open grassland. Will I be compensated for the loss in property value? Will I have to pursue this issue to be compensated? My next door neighbour bought his house 12 months ago for the same reason and no searches at the time showed anything, and now he finds this proposal is now a reality. Do you think this is reasonable?? 2. From a personal perspective there are considerable wildlife habitats which you're so called "expert" surveyors when wandering around / "assessing" failed to notice. These will be affected. See the enclosed photos from my garden, it is awarded a mention by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust as a wildlife friendly garden and as these are nightly occurrences they will be adversely affected by destroying their habitats. Do you think this is reasonable?? 3. Building an estate on this greenbelt land will cause noise and traffic pollution for all the people adjoining the proposed site. Do you think this is reasonable ?? 4. Werrington now has over subscribed schools and a GP surgery full to capacity with appointment times running into weeks, how will adding additional houses and the consequent population increase help this ? Do you think this is reasonable ?? 5. Having lived here for a while and observing this almost daily occurrence in the evening there is a scenario for the "inmates" at the young offenders institution to be exercising/playing football etc and their shouting and swearing is readily heard from my house 300 metres away. Is this the place to site houses maybe with young families who will have to listen to this kind of language ? Do you think this is reasonable ?? 6. We are a designated village community and area WE003 is by and large inhabited by people who wished to live in a semi-rural area and not be blighted by housing estates and so bought properties near to open fields etc. There are various other sites within the Staffordshire Moorlands remit that could be developed without ruining the prospects of people who have saved up to live here or retire in this lovely village. Do you think this is reasonable ?? I don't expect any feedback from this but it is not solely my objection to this proposal, I am speaking for the residents affected by this matter. Photographs supplied (see attached).	• See response to PO1161 regarding Green Belt • See response to PO1168 regarding loss of property value • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO95 regarding the proximity to YO1 • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution
PO1216	Mrs Elizabeth				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council	• Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Holdcroft					to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YO1 land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	affordable • See response to PO1432 regarding flooding • See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO1224	Mr Andrew Aston				Object	I wish to register my objection and dissatisfaction to the proposed housing allocation on Ash Bank Road on what is currently green belt land. Werrington is a small village on the outskirts of Stoke-On-Trent and any large development would detrimentally affect its character for numerous reasons. The doctor's surgery in particular is already under intense pressure from the elderly demographic. There is now just one Primary school for such an increasingly large catchment area and class sizes could only suffer. Traffic at the crossroads and surrounding environs, as well as residential parking is already at bursting point; a greater number of vehicles are likely to exacerbate this issue. Water run-off on that side of the road and bank is currently manageable, but it could be the case that this development would reduce water retention and result in localised flooding. I would hope that the planning committee take these points into consideration before making a hasty decision.	• See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure and flooding • See response to PO95 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1225	Mrs Karen Simpson				Object	I have lived in Salters Close, Werrington, for over 22 years and originally bought this house, with my husband, with one of the main reasons being the stunning rear view of country side from our garden, kitchen and bedroom windows. Please find attached a few photo's that have been done by my daughter. I wish to object to plans to build around the back of Salters Close for the following reasons: The ground proposed for building is Green Belt. Scenery will be lost. Wildlife will be killed. There will be no privacy. Our family home will loose financial value. With the ascending landscape at the back, our house will be grossly overlooked as the new houses will have an elevated advantage looking down over ours. The properties in Salters Close were built with a downstairs bathroom My family, including two teenage children, will be unable to open the downstairs bathroom window to release steam as houses would be able to see directly in our bathroom (photo's attached). Traffic volumes would be increased right by a school crossing that has many near misses as it is. We are already heavily burdened with shouting and swearing coming from the prison, sometimes fighting can be heard. People will not want to pay for a brand new house and have to put up with that sort of noise pollution. I believe, for that reason, if the new houses were to be built there would be a large number that would remain empty as they would be hard to sell. Selling new houses without informing new home owners of noise pollution from prison could cause legal problems for the Council in the future. The new houses will also be hard to sell because they will be grossly overlooked by the big houses on Ash Bank that will have an elevated advantage over new ones.	• See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity and proximity to the YOI • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution
PO1228	Mrs Cheryl Holdcroft				Object	I had planned to attend the meeting regarding the building proposal for Werrington, at the Methodist Church. Unfortunately I am unable, but would like to register my feelings with regards to the proposals. I live at Ash Bank and the HMYOI is directly behind me. The last time any building work was done there, the proposal was an extension to visitor centre and car par. They tripled the size of the prison itself. I have no objection to the building of suitable properties, but I do object to them being built within 200 yards of the centre. I am a good 150-200 yards away, and I have to put up with the shouting out of the windows into the early hours of the morning. I pity anyone who would have to live closer to the centre than that. I also object to the building on green belt land. Please register my objection, I feel very strongly about this. I look forward to individual consultations.	• See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity and proximity to the YOI
PO1241	Mrs Christine Chadwick				Object	I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of the proposed houses in this location. Why build on green belt land when there are brown field sites and other suitable locations in the area. Pressure on the village would be considerable; the reasons are the inadequacy of the Ashbank Road. It is heavily used by heavy	• See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO95 regarding highways, residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						goods, buses, private cars. Rush hour is horrendous and at times I can not get in or out of my drive at these peak times. Schools, Doctors and other amenities would be subject to unsustainable pressure. The outstanding natural beautiful view from my home and the concern for the active wild life Foxes, Hares, Rabbits, and Birds etc. My other concerns to this development are: 1 Greenbeltland 2 Close proximity HMYOI site 3 Poor access onto the A52 as suggested by the Highways Department. Where I live near Washer wall Lane junction deeply concerns me due to the volume of traffic we get now with out adding to it. 4 Increased population is unsupportable for employment. 5 Eradicate village status. 6 50 Dwellings is out of character with the open nature, do not destroy our countryside, openness of land should be preserved. This development would deeply infringe on my privacy and family life.	- See response to PO1212 regarding loss of views - See response to PO53 regarding wildlife - See response to PO1432 regarding landscape
PO1412	Mrs Christine Chadwick				Object	I write in connection with the above planning application and I know the site well. I wish to object to the development of the proposed houses in this location. Why build on green belt land when there are brown field's sites and other suitable locations in the area. Pressure on the village would be considerable; the reasons are inadequacy of Ash Bank Road. It is used by HGVS, buses, private cars. Rush hour is horrendous and at times I cannot get in or out of my drive. Schools ad Drs and other amenities would be subject to a sustainable pressure. The outstanding natural beautiful view from my home and the concern for the active wild life, foxes, hares, rabbits, and birds etc.	- See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt - See response to PO1232 regarding brownfield sites - See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO95 regarding highways
PO1243	Mr and Mrs Derek Brindley				Object	My wife and I have just returned from a Public Meeting in discussing plans to build 111 houses in Werrington from now to 2031. We are left with serious concerns after viewing plans of potential sites. We live at Oak Mount opposite a potential site for 50 houses. Whilst we recognise a need of housing we believe strongly they could be better located. We ask that original plans as submitted in September 2015 be reviewed. We OBJECT STRONGLY to current proposals. Our objections include: - all locations feed immediately onto an existing busy main road, the A52 is already difficult to negotiate and overcrowded with heavy vehicles. - there is lacking the infrastructure such as doctors, schooling etc. - further eating away green belt area which would leave it vulnerable for the future and further considerations for development.	- See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt - See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO95 regarding highways
PO1261	Mr Paul Seabridge				Object	The meeting regarding release of land for a housing association building program is quite soon & I was only made aware of it on sunday the 30th. I am unable to attend the meeting you have set up, I do however have comments I wish to put forward. 1. I understand that the old infants school off stonehouse road is already set to be developed into a sizable housing project. 2. adding these additional plots of land for a housing association to develop into no doubt lots of smaller houses, will mean that	- See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure - See response to PO95 regarding highways - See response to PO1168 regarding property value

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						the already over capacity doctors & local schools will be beyond bursting point & even more difficult or impossible to get into for the already existing residents. 3. the A52 main road to hanley / cellerhead is already gridlocked & at a standstill during a good part of the day (i.e.)school & work start/finish hours also clough lane - Hulme lane - Winterfield lane are both badly maintained & tricky to negotiate safely during rush hours or snow & ice conditions, especially at the end of Winterfield lane where it joins leek road, it is now normally blocked partly by the vehicle repair business recovery wagon & cars that seem to be parked up on the road most daytimes at the leek road end. 4. due to the additional traffic this can / will cause delays to the emergency services traveling up & down the A52 & could therefore at worst could have life threatening implications. 5. if these houses are for a housing association then I also believe the general values of the local property in the are will be affected adversely. 6. it is also questionable if adding a good number of people requiring a housing association property maybe introducing people who have loose morals & therefore a rise in crime or drugs/drink related behaviour could also become a problem. These are just off the top of my head & I am sure there are many other reasons that a scheme of this size should not go ahead. In summary I object strongly to these proposals.	
PO1409	Mrs E Weston				Object	We wish to strongly object to the following WE003, WE053, WE052. These developments would have a monumental impact on this village. Ash Bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside School. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which included HGV's buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington population is largely made up of older residents more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the green belt on wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of natural beauty with abundance of wildlife and feel this needs protected. Infill building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the green belt and Village Status	• See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife
PO1406	Mrs B Turnock				Object	About the preferred site WE003 in Werrington, how this site can be considered, I live across the road from it, especially in summer you can hear the prisoners shouting and swearing, so how do you think people in the house right on top of the prison will be,, no one in their right mind would want to live there, and the road in that area is chaos we have trouble getting off our drive now, as there needs some calming measures in on this new road now. Get in the Drs Now is difficult, now this village cannot cope now and we always thought this land was green belt? What about the school, you have put new housing on the old school, but I believe you have let them of get off without making provisions for affordable houses? This site is not suitable for house or anything	• See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO95 regarding proximity to YO1

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						else where vehicles are involved, the way these cars/bike s etc. speed you would think it's a motorway.	
PO2076	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	Object - Proximity to YO1, a significant encroachment into Green Belt and as identified by SCC presents traffic problems. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	• See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt and alternative sites • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO95 regarding highways
PO3859	Mr Spencer Hodgetts				Object	Following the well attended meeting organised by Werrington Parish Council on the 15th June 2016. We must further add our support to the voted on, and agreed proposal that all potential sites be revisited again with a view to looking at the far less intrusive and acceptable option of fulfilling the required housing numbers through in-fill along all the initially proposed sites and with linear development along existing building lines - rather than by block building down into greenfield sites. Yours faithfully, Spencer and Jean Hodgetts	• See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO9378	Mr Nick Simpson				Object	I have lived in Salters Close for over 24 years. I brought this property in mind to raise a family & to have a little piece of countryside with in green belt area. I feel that due to the land been owned by the prison & no longer wanted by them that it is in the government's best/own financial interest to sell & develop it regardless of the views of the people of Werrington. With any development at the rear of my house I would lose all of my privacy. With what would be raised elevation new builds they would look down directly into my home. Also houses behind them would be looking down into any new builds. There are a lot of mature trees with in the greenbelt area that would be lost. I have noticed an increase in birds & other wildlife in & around my garden. This also includes hedgehogs & bats which I am unsure where the roost. What I do know is they come out every evening. I feel has Werrington is known for its height/location & one of the main views overlooking miles of open countryside from the memorial monument would be lost forever. Access to very busy road is going to cause its own problems. Traffic currently backs quite a way from the crossroads & seems to have seen arise in the number of minor road accidents. More junctions – More risk. The houses in & around this area should be given the choice to stay as they were intended (built on edge of lovely countryside) & NOT become part of a housing estate. I would have thought a better all-round solution would be to consider building on land located to the south of the housing estate on Chatsworth drive as would have less impact. To build homes so close to a prison seems to me to be ridiculous. The noise from the prison can be very audible & constant. The inmates are not shouting the queens English, it's foul & abusive language. This goes on very late into the night & can obviously spoil evenings sitting in the garden – no one wants to hear it. Summer months I even have to close my windows to get to sleep. If I was to sell my home I	• See response to PO95 regarding highways, residential amenity and proximity to YO1 • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife/trees • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites • See response to PO1437 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						believe I would legally be obliged to note on the sellers property information form the noise pollution from the prison. Surely the same would go for any new homes as this problem is obvious. To me & others Werrington is a special place to live and does not need to be spoilt by unwanted over development within green belt. My area is Staffordshire Moorland for a reason & I wish for it to remain so.	
PO9656	Mr Robert McGuinness				Support	I am writing on behalf of my clients concerning the latest consultation by SMDC regarding the Site Allocations Development Plans to re-affirm the following: That they confirm their willingness for land allocated to the western part of Site WE003 and known as land adjacent Stonehouse Farm, Werrington to continue to be included within said area for the purposes of proposed housing development (as a preferred site).	Comments noted
PO9528	Mr Nicholas Harding				Object	Object to development of site WE003 for the following reasons: Close proximity to HMYOI site. The anti-social impact of the prison should be taken into consideration, prior to any decision being made on the land. Have the council even considered how dangerous and inappropriate it is close to an institution such as HMYOI Werrington. Local residents currently face anti-social behaviours from the inmates at HMYOI often swearing and shouting till late into the night. Also drug dealing in the field to take the drug up to the prison fences, this has been reported to the police. Poor access onto A52 - Staffordshire County Council acknowledges that this site presents highways problems because it is situated on a busy main road on the brow of a hill. Given that building on WE003 gives the highways concern from a point of entry and that it is already a very busy road surely given that is also in close proximity to a school and bus stops both below and above by the local post office surely this will cause congestion that is already an issue. Infrastructure – Schools – Already oversubscribed schools. Schools some distance away increased car journeys required. A52 very dangerous especially around Washerwall Lane junction. Infrastructure – Other – doctors and dentists already at capacity. Few services in Werrington have to use car to go to other areas shops/schools etc. Demand on local churches. Where are the jobs to support increased population. Landscape – area is greenbelt and inappropriate use Greenbelt review should be undertaken and recommendations taken into account. Do not destroy our countryside. Openness of land should be preserved. Visual impact on landscape and SLA and historic park lands. View of area is wonderful. SCC has produced a historic environment assessment for area. This document describes the heritage values of the landscape as of high historical value, high aesthetic and high evidential value. This document recommends 'there is little capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the historic landscape character.' Field retains historic hedgerows. Long distance views of Derbyshire and Wem Nature Conservation – natural habitat will	• See response to PO95 regarding residential amenity, proximity of YOI and highways • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure, employment, landscape & heritage impact, impact on Cenotaph, local plan process and flooding • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						be ruined for a wide range of wildlife including pond life. Since the closure of the Werrington prison community pathway this is now over grown and has become a haven for a variety of wildlife and gives a sense of country to what is a beautiful village. Land available and proposed in better areas should therefore be used. WE003 is full of wildlife many of the mature trees surrounding the site are inhabited by bats and many bird species - conserve and enhance biodiversity not destroy it. Flood Risk – land is boggy developing here could cause flooding elsewhere. Could create artificial flood plain on clay land. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – loss of privacy, views and amenity. In the comment made by the council in response to the consultation made last summer it states that amenity issues will be assessed in detail once the site has been laid out and planning application has been received. Surely when deciding if a site should be taken into consideration at the current time as this determines whether this land is suitable or not? i.e. if the land is substantially elevated regardless of the type of development residents will be overlooked and their privacy rights shall be affected. Impact of noise, disturbance, overlooking and overshadowing. Scale of development – potential to increase housing numbers in future as field large. Eradicate village status. It would be a shame that so near to the cenotaph that represents our war hero's could face constant traffic coming and going across from it when for years it has been a peaceful place to go and reflect on those we have lost to war. Ash Bank Road strong settlement boundary line. 50 dwellings is out of character with the open nature. Impact on Human Rights – see caselaw - (Bovis Homes Limited v New Forest District Council ADMN 2002 (2202) EWHC 483 “Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic wellbeing of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. In the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposed delivery of circa 50 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect on the area, however the site is inaccessible to areas of existing employment, which would have a significant negative effect. Similarly, the sites inaccessibility to services and facilities and areas of open space is likely to have a negative affect. Also, the sites district ecological importance is likely to have a negative affect, as could the development of greenfield grade 4 ALC land and the sites proximity to historic assets is assessed as having a negative effect.	
PO9594	Mrs A Meakin				Object	Letter with response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site WE003: most residents against this site alternative sites suggested by Parish Council/residents, not	• See response to PO1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO95 regarding

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						considered/investigated by District Council Numerous objections to development of this site [Green belt/ close proximity to HMYOI/ poor access onto A52, dangerous road bend/ local infrastructure\services already at capacity/ etc] [quotes from site sustainability appraisal, including stated negative impacts] Would request planners refer to court case Bovis Homes Ltd v New Forest District Council ADMN (2002) development of site would mean our Human Rights under Human Rights Act 1998 would be infringed SCC Highways acknowledges site has problems (busy road brow of a hill) Werrington Prison since closed - overgrown has become haven for wildlife.	highways, residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1432 regarding local plan process
PO9597	Mr J Meakin				Object	Letter with response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site WE003: most residents against this site alternative sites suggested by Parish Council/residents, not considered/investigated by District Council Numerous objections to development of this site [Green belt/ close proximity to HMYOI/ poor access onto A52, dangerous road bend/ local infrastructure\services already at capacity/ etc] [quotes from site sustainability appraisal, including stated negative impacts] Would request planners refer to court case Bovis Homes Ltd v New Forest District Council ADMN (2002) development of site would mean our Human Rights under Human Rights Act 1998 would be infringed SCC Highways acknowledges site has problems (busy road brow of a hill) Werrington Prison since closed - overgrown has become haven for wildlife.	• See response to PO95 regarding highways, residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1432 regarding local plan process
PO9335	Mrs Julie Smith				Object	As a lifetime resident of Werrington I wish to express my concerns regarding the proposed site of WE003. During the last consultation and the consultation held by Werrington Parish Council it was discussed and agreed by the majority of the residents who attended the open meeting, that the development of the land known as WE003 was against the wishes of said residents. Alternative sites were put forward by the Parish Council and also the residents of Werrington, these sites have not been taken into consideration and in some cases have not been correctly investigated for potential development sites, I would request the officers involved in the proposed development sites regarding Werrington to actually visit the village and assess what damage would be caused by an on mass development proposal: Greenbelt site. Close proximity to YOI site. Poor access onto A52 as suggested by Highways Department. Infrastructure – Schools – Already oversubscribed schools. Schools some distance away increased car journeys required. Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – entrance to site is on to a dangerous road and near bad bend/brow of hill. Access to A52 difficult especially if on a bike. A52 very dangerous especially around Washerwall Lane junction. Infrastructure – Other – doctors already at capacity. Few services in Werrington have to use car to go to other areas shops/schools etc. Demand on local churches. Where are the jobs to support increased population. Landscape – area is greenbelt	• See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites and the Green Belt • See response to PO95 regarding highways and residential amenity • See response to PO1432 regarding employment, infrastructure, flooding, landscape and local plan process • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the village. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						and inappropriate use Greenbelt review should be undertaken and recommendations taken into account. Do not destroy our countryside. Openness of land should be preserved. Visual impact on landscape and SLA and historic park lands. View of area is wonderful. SCC has produced a historic environment assessment for area. This document describes the heritage values of the landscape as of high historical value, high aesthetic and high evidential value. This document recommends - 'there is little capacity to absorb change without fundamentally altering the historic landscape character. Field retains historic hedgerows. Long distance views of Derbyshire and Wem Nature Conservation – natural habitat will be ruined for a wide range of wildlife including pond life. All wildlife gone. Conserve and enhance biodiversity not destroy it. Flood Risk – land is boggy developing here could cause flooding elsewhere. Could create artificial flood plain on clay land. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – loss of privacy, views and amenity. Impact of noise, disturbance, overlooking and overshadowing. Scale of development – potential to increase housing numbers in future as field large. Eradicate village status. Ash Bank Road strong settlement boundary line. 50 dwellings is out of character with the open nature. The proposed delivery of circa 50 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect on the area, however the site is inaccessible to areas of existing employment, which would have a significant negative effect. Similarly, the sites inaccessibility to services and facilities and areas of open space is likely to have a negative affect. Also, the sites district ecological importance is likely to have a negative affect, as could the development of greenfield grade 4 ALC land and the sites proximity to historic assets is assessed as having a negative effect. Reference: Bovis Homes Limited v New Forest District Council ADMN 2002 (2202) EWHC 483 I would request the planners to refer to this particular case as part of the consultation. Should this proposed development take place we believe that our human rights will be infringed as laid out below: Human Rights Act 1998 Schedule 1 Part 1 Article 8 1 Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. 2 There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. May I also add that further down the bank at the crossroads of the church /chemist many years ago did not have traffic lights , the traffic was so busy and so difficult to get out of junctions , this alongside the danger to children crossing at this point made it necessary to put traffic lights in , the proposed arrangements will be much worse being	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						on a brow of a hill ! Also you are taking away the peaceful area where people go to remember people who were lost in the war , this area would no longer be a peaceful sanctuary with the addition of new houses already being built on the old school site.	
PO9340	Mrs Lynne Dodd				Object	In our opinion the house planning proposal for werrington is unacceptable no green belt should be used for houses.The original proposal for infill should be used.Ideally we do not want to see anymore new buildings as the roads are choked at certain times of the day.The village surgery cannot attract any new doctors waiting times are rising and with more housing can only get worse.We hope this will be taken into consideration after all we have to live here.	• See response to PO 1161 regarding the Green belt • See response to PO95 regarding highways • See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure
PO9352	Mr Gavin Walters				Object	My property is close to this site - object for the following reasons: Residents are already disturbed by noise from the detention centre so bringing the building housing closer would exacerbate this problem; A clear boundary should be in place just for separation and safety to local residents; When i purchased the house, the report came back and said it was land that couldn't be built on as it was required by the centre; I moved to werrington to join a friendly, safe and quiet neighbourhood. I am worried that the over crowding would completely take this away as having houses all around salters close would obviously bring additional noise and spoil the views and country feel. Basically it ruins the main reasons that I moved to salters close; The entry on ashbank for these houses is dangerous. The brow of a hill is not ideal. Already its a nightmare for the post office visitors so adding this on the same stretch will no doubt cause more accidents; Sewage and drainage should be seriously considered as well. It's not looking too great around salters close and we dont want any errors that cause problems, especially with the unpredictable weather; A bigger concern is that some of the housing will be used for social housing. I am completely against any social houses being built around an area I live. Building in line with the road like what currently is in place down the road would be fine. This doesn't effect the boundary, spoil greenbelt areas and over crowd a quiet area in Werrington.	• See response to PO95 regarding proximity to YOI and highways • See response to PO1432 regarding flooding and infrastructure • See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites
PO9358	Ms ROVEINA MITCHELL				Object	Object to this development for the following reasons: Safety: Ashbank road is an incredibly busy road. It's not only used by the residents of Werrington but by commuters travelling to other parts of the area and of course theres the school which attracts high volumes of traffic. The high volumes of traffic makes it difficult to cross the road on regular occasions. I also fear for the safety of children living close by. This can also lead to traffic accidents. Boundary of the HMYOI: Noise levels are surprising high, I can hear sirens and shouting at all hours. I can imagine this only increasing if houses at situated closer to the detention centre. I also believe this would be rather intimidating/scary for children living in close proximity. I think it's important to have some sort of boundary/space between residential housing and	• See response to PO95 regarding highways, residential amenity and proximity to YOI • See response to PO53 regarding wildlife • See response to PO1166 regarding the need for houses • See response to 1161 regarding the Green Belt • See response to PO9335 regarding development design

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						the detention centre. What if something we to go wrong or individuals were to escape. I realise that is an extreme case, but prisoners have escaped from prisons before in Britain so it's something to take into account. Having space (what there is now) in between the detention centre and residential homes increases safety. Extra minutes are vital in dangerous situations. Please take this into consideration! Quality of life: This is incredibly important There are several reasons why Werrington is a desirable place to live. The sense of space is one of those reasons. Thats why I believe the proposed areas would be better for the community - the new home quota is met and the sense of space and greenery is maintained. This isn't just about the existing residents but for the new residents too, they should be able to enjoy the same benefits. I moved here from London and the main reason I moved here is because of the sense of space. It's quiet and private, this is so important. Desirability of the area: This is a big factor when it comes to the prosperity of an area. There is always a direct correlation between prosperity and desirability. One of the best things about Werrington is that it actually has a village feel despite being so close to Stoke. By 'filling in the gaps' this will diminish. This will also destroy the spirit of the village. Considering Werrinton is so close to Stoke it's very attractive and pleasant. Because Stoke has a history within an industry there is a large volume of social housing, cramped areas and terence houses. Having places like Werrington helps with the city's overall living standards. It would be a great shame to loose this. I believe Longton was once considered a nice place to live especially as it has large family houses. But as the gaps were filled this destroyed the value of the area. Overcrowding definitely contributes to the demise of an area - another reason why I believe having the new houses spread around is much better. Please keep Werrington as a nice place to live and not just somewhere that use to be nice. Local factors: The roads are in a terrible state - This could only get worse with more houses squashed along Ashbank road. Green Belts - they are important. Not only for the local community but for local wildlife too. I see several foxes, rabbits, pheasants, numerous birds and several other animals. Because much of the surrounding land is farm land it's important to have something left somewhat wild for animals to live and flourish. House prices will be negatively affected by the district councils proposals. Overall, I understand new houses need to be built due to the demand but please consider carefully where these should be built. By following the parishes proposals you meet the quota and everything which makes the village a nice and safe place to live are maintained.	
PO1386	Mr and Mrs C Beech				Object	As a resident (i have lived in the area for 45years) I wish to object most strongly to the preferred site' WE003 for Werrington + Cellarhead . The parish council in the 2015 consultation	• See response to PO1161 regarding alternative sites • See response to PO95 regarding access

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						suggested another site lower down Ash Bank with better access to the A52 why has this not been looked at? Why has this not been looked at? The preferred Site' will have upwards of 100 cars coming out onto the a52 at the top of a dangerous hill and close to the traffic lights where it is always congested. There are local builders who have been refused for a why? Officers should listen to the residents the schools and the surgeries are already oversubscribed. The site on a wet morning when the children are being taken to school by car, it is gridlocked.	See response to PO1432 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO246	Mr Simon Freisner	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Support	SITE WE013 - LITTLE ASH FARM, ASH BANK ROAD, WERRINGTON On behalf of my I write in support of the site's draft Potential Allocation in the Local Plan and the presumed removal of the site and the adjoining potential allocated site WE027 from the Green Belt. Discussions have taken place with the owner of the adjoining site and (WE027) and both owners accept that the two sites would be best served by a joint access. The site's advantages are: · 98 out of the 99 comments received by the Council supported the development of the land. · The site is partially 'brownfield' or previously developed land as there is already a house and substantial outbuildings there. The remainder of the site, whilst possibly greenfield land is garden laid to grass and includes a hard surface tennis court. · The land is immediately available. · There are trees on the boundaries bordering the green belt which would provide screening. · There would be relatively little impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review carried out for the Council recommends the site's release. · The land has low ecological value such that it was not assessed in the Phase 1 ecological review carried out for the Council. · There is an existing access to the house which could be used as joint access to the adjoining land. · There is no flood or contamination risk.	Support noted
PO485	Ms Lynne Boulton				General comment	I have previously commented on the potential significant detrimental impact of this development, on the residents of those properties which back onto the proposed site, and the adjoining area (WE027); also the effect on drainage and the environment around those properties which are adjacent to the field to the rear of the site. The field provides a habitat home to a large number of wildlife species, including owls and badgers, which could be negatively affected. There will be inevitable disruption to us local residents during the development phase (noise, dust and traffic movements) and in future, loss of privacy and open views to the rear of our properties. There will also be a consequent reduction in value of those properties affected. Although there will be less impact on me and my close neighbours from housing in this preferred area, I am particularly concerned about ongoing development 'creep, ie once an access is created to the site, along with the infrastructure to support the properties being built (roadways and utility services), there is nothing to prevent the area expanding over time and occupying more of the open rural land. I would like reassurance that this will not happen. The ground space which will be occupied by this and the adjacent site, will also reduce the gap between our rural village in Staffordshire Moorlands, and the city of Stoke-on-Trent.	• The site is not a designated wildlife site. It was not been assessed in Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 if it is taken forward as an allocation consideration will need to be given to the biodiversity of the site. • Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was limited. It recommended that the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. - Issues such as overlooking, screening and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. - The Local Plan will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
PO1178	Ms J Forster				Object	I have just attended a local residents /parish council meeting tonight to discuss the proposed development of 111 houses in Werrington. I wish to support the view put forward at the meeting, that Smdc revisit the previous sites identified and review it's proposals. In particular I object to the development at the back of Ash Bank Road. By allowing this to take place will increase the likelihood that you will allow further development along this stretch of road in the future. Congestion on the A52 is already an issue! Not to mention the greenbelt. A point was raised that the Young Offenders Institute may close in Werrington in the near future. A large area of land will become available.....	- See response to PO485 regarding future development and the Green Belt - The Highway Authority consider the site may be acceptable subject to detail of access design and visibility. It would need to be developed with WE027 to be adequate for adoption as highway.
PO1187	Mr Darren Williams				Object	I absolutely object to the plans to build houses in Werrington on the A52. My drive is directly accessed from this already dangerous road and I have emailed the County Council many times about my concerns-especially the 40mph limit. The large number of schoolchildren (who are socially urged to walk more) walking on a very narrow footpath (next to the chip shop/Chinese). I urge someone to carry out this task in the flesh as a HGV hurtles past at speed, believe me it is very unnerving! There WILL be an accident, my previous emails have stated this and my concerns are documented. It is only a matter of time. So instead of addressing this and introducing speed calming measures or speed reduction, the bright idea of an additional strain on the very dangerous stretch of road, incredible. Yes, you can then reduce the speed but can you reduce the number of cars? In each direction leaving	- See response to PO1178 regarding highways - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Werrington, obviously people would HAVE to travel out of the VILLAGE to work, there is severe congestion. Towards Cheadle, Weston Coyney, Leek and in particular Hanley. I see the traffic daily and avoid it if at all possible. Werrington needs traffic REDUCING, not increasing. The obvious strains on doctors, churches, dentist, facilities for young people etc. will be felt but the most interesting strain is the one on schools. Ridiculously, there is currently building work ongoing putting 30 houses where a school used to be! These are not yet completed and the effect and impact of the extra strain on the VILLAGE hasn't yet taken effect. Less than a mile away at Cellarhead, additional "affordable housing" has been built. Most of these have yet to impact the area with additional children. Let's take the 30 houses behind Oak Mount Road, averaging 2.4 children each=132 people, approximately 60 cars. Really, this hasn't even been absorbed into the area yet. How on Earth can the VILLAGE take more and more without monitoring the effect of the already bursting population? I urge someone to queue in the traffic taking children to Moorside High School, then turn around into more traffic to queue through Werrington into Hanley. Then try the walk to school, if you dare. Please document this as an absolute formal objection to these proposals and acknowledge receipt of this prior to the deadline date.	is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO1197	Mr Paul Dean				Object	I object to anymore houses being built in Werrington - it is an act of lunacy and disrespect to the existing residents! The tensions are building up and how much more are we expected to take before matters get out of hand, you have a social responsibility towards us and make our lives bearable. My proposition would be to build an entirely new village, if we really do have to be build in the Moorlands, preferably towards the Tean and Blythe Bridge area by the A50 where there is a large road in place for ease of access and transport. This would then offer people the selection of choice of either accessing Derby and Burton-on-Trent or Stoke on Trent for retail and employment. It can be seen Stoke on Trent is failing badly and by building houses in Werrington you are isolating them from opportunities, I personally try not to set foot in Stoke-on-Trent any longer and many in the village are of the same opinion. There are far too many houses in Werrington now and this started in the 1980s with the Meigh Road estate and especially in the 1990s when you built the Hill Village Road estate. Even now they are building more houses on the old Werrington First School site, in fact they are squeezing them in, causing a grotesque eyesore - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! The junction at Washerwall Lane is not going to get any bigger and the gridlocks are a daily occurrence and this is not environmentally friendly, the pollution is getting out of hand as the road congestion increases. The A52 down into Stoke-on-Trent is not going to change and it is the same for the A53 from Leek, these roads were put in place a long time ago and there is nothing you	• See response to PO1187 regarding infrastructure • See response PO1178 regarding highways • Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area is considered • The Environment Agency consider there are known flooding issues in the area and The Staffordshire Local Lead Flood Authority have it on their records as a flooding hotspot . The EA have requested a level 2 SFRA to be completed if the site is to be considered for allocation. • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						can do to enable them to have a larger carrying capacity. Only foolish people will sit around loading data into a computer trying to come up with some solution to later find in practice it fails, this seems to be the approach they take in Stoke-on-Trent. Both the A52 and A53 are operating on maximum capacity and cannot carry any more vehicles - have you conducted a recent traffic survey? There was no foresight back when they were built to increase capacity, so only the most ignorant of planners will attempt to try anything. Other infrastructure within Werrington is also at capacity such as the Doctors and School and we do not want any more shops or take aways being built here either! If people desire urban living they can go and live in the City - as this is a village. I am also concerned about the rising water table in the village and existing flooding problems as there are Springs everywhere, the road names Draw Well Lane and Washerwall Lane give indication of this. I see no evidence of any hydrological surveys and whether the existing drains can take anymore new builds. To build more houses in the Moorlands around the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is the wrong approach to take for future generations and we will only get sucked into the continuing failures of that City. Although there was recent talk of a boundary change and Werrington becoming a part of Stoke-on-Trent, so if you do decide to build more houses here it may be worth my time to start lobbying for a boundary change. I want to make representation and speak to somebody at the Council as soon as possible regarding this.	
PO1209	Mr Philip Jones				Object	I apologise for the late submission of my concerns regarding one of the proposed sites for housing in Werrington, I have only recently found the leaflet posted to us. I have attempted to use your portal but it appears to be inaccessible. I am writing to raise concerns regarding the proposed site opposite the road Bridal Path and adjacent to 244 Ashbank Road. (Site codes WE013 and WE027). 1) When we bought the house back in 2009 we were aware that the house had been subject to at least 2 floods which caused considerable damage to the inside of the property. After an investigation by the council department responsible, it was found that a small brook that runs behind the property had been covered over, with a pipe used to supposedly allow the water to run through. The council took steps to force the land owner to return the brook to its original condition. This seemed to have rectified the issue. 2) The land owner has also applied on a number of occasions to build on this land and it has been refused on both occasions. It seems ridiculous that the council is now looking at adding this site to build houses on. 3) We have issues with our garden being sodden for most of the year and if we now add the addition of more concrete going into the ground as foundations for the properties and the road I am worried that this will only exacerbate the problem. 4) As the number of vehicles on the road have increased over the years we have	• See response to PO1197 regarding flooding • See response to PO1178 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						found it more and more difficult to exit our drive onto the main road, the position of our drive and our neighbours including the proposed exit of the housing development makes it very difficult to view vehicles coming down the bank, also with the business premises directly opposite the new access/exit site we have at present constant near miss accidents with cars pulling onto and off the open car parking area this may be a risk factor you need to consider.	
PO1217	Mrs Elizabeth Holdcroft				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YO1 land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	• Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable • See response to PO1197 regarding flooding • See response to PO1178 regarding highways • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed.
PO1245	Mr and Mrs Derek Brindley				Object	My wife and I have just returned from a Public Meeting in discussing plans to build 111 houses in Werrington from now to 2031. We are left with serious concerns after viewing plans of potential sites. We live at Oak Mount opposite a potential site for 50 houses. Whilst we recognise a need of housing we believe strongly they could be better located. We ask that original plans	• See response to PO1178 regarding highways • See response to PO1187 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO485 regarding Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						as submitted in September 2015 be reviewed. We OBJECT STRONGLY to current proposals. Our objections include: - all locations feed immediately onto an existing busy main road, the A52 is already difficult to negotiate and overcrowded with heavy vehicles. - there is lacking the infrastructure such as doctors, schooling etc. - further eating away green belt area which would leave it vulnerable for the future and further considerations for development.	
PO2081	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Support	Support - generally maintains line of buildings and not substantial encroachment into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Support noted
PO2702	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	If it is decided to continue with sites in the floodplain or likely to be following the application of the Sequential Test, then further work in the form of a Level 2 SFRA will be required for the following site: WE013 which along with WE027 is adjacent to Watercourses with no mapped floodplain. This does not mean the site is within Flood Zone 1. It is imperative that the flood risk to these sites is quantified prior to final submission as it may affect the deliverability of the sites, particularly the smaller ones in Werrington. Because in both cases the sites are adjacent to each other, producing one model for each is more cost effective than needing to for individual sites.	Comments noted
PO2576	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Planning Manager Sport England			Object	The proposal appears to lead to the loss of a football pitch and tennis court. This is not in accordance with NPPF 74 unless the sports facilities are going to be replaced. If so this needs to be a requirement in the Local Plan document.	Comments noted. Awaiting results of the Open Space Study regarding open space provision. The facilities referred to are in private ownership.
PO9342	Mrs Lynne Dodd				Object	In our opinion the house planning proposal for werrington is unacceptable no green belt should be used for houses. The original proposal for infill should be used. Ideally we do not want to see anymore new buildings as the roads are choked at certain times of the day. The village surgery cannot attract any new doctors waiting times are rising and with more housing can only get worse. We hope this will be taken into consideration after all we have to live here.	- See response to PO485 regarding Green Belt - See response PO1178 regarding highways - See response to PO1187 regarding infrastructure
PO9353	Mr Gavin Walters				Object	Object to development here. Building in line with the road like what currently is in place down the road would be fine. This doesn't effect the boundary, spoil greenbelt areas and over crowd a quiet area in Werrington.	See response to PO1217
PO9359	Ms ROVEINA MITCHELL				Object	Object to this development for the following reasons: Safety: Ashbank road is an incredibly busy road. It's not only used by the residents of Werrington but by commuters travelling to other parts of the area and of course theres the school which attracts high volumes of traffic. The high volumes of traffic makes it difficult to cross the road on regular occasions. I also fear for the safety of children living close by. This can also lead to traffic accidents. Quality of life: This is incredibly important There are several reasons why Werrington is a desirable place to live. The sense of space is one of those reasons. Thats why I believe the proposed areas would be better for the community - the new	- See response to PO1178 regarding highways - See response to PO485 regarding the Green Belt and wildlife - See response to PO1197 regarding design

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						home quota is met and the sense of space and greenery is maintained. This isn't just about the existing residents but for the new residents too, they should be able to enjoy the same benefits. I moved here from London and the main reason I moved here is because of the sense of space. It's quiet and private, this is so important. Desirability of the area: This is a big factor when it comes to the prosperity of an area. There is always a direct correlation between prosperity and desirability. One of the best things about Werrington is that it actually has a village feel despite being so close to Stoke. By 'filling in the gaps' this will diminish. This will also destroy the spirit of the village. Considering Werrington is so close to Stoke it's very attractive and pleasant. Because Stoke has a history within an industry there is a large volume of social housing, cramped areas and terrace houses. Having places like Werrington helps with the city's overall living standards. It would be a great shame to lose this. I believe Longton was once considered a nice place to live especially as it has large family houses. But as the gaps were filled this destroyed the value of the area. Overcrowding definitely contributes to the demise of an area - another reason why I believe having the new houses spread around is much better. Please keep Werrington as a nice place to live and not just somewhere that used to be nice. Local factors: The roads are in a terrible state - This could only get worse with more houses squashed along Ashbank road. Green Belts - they are important. Not only for the local community but for local wildlife too. I see several foxes, rabbits, pheasants, numerous birds and several other animals. Because much of the surrounding land is farm land it's important to have something left somewhat wild for animals to live and flourish. House prices will be negatively affected by the district council's proposals. Overall, I understand new houses need to be built due to the demand but please consider carefully where these should be built. By following the parish's proposals you meet the quota and everything which makes the village a nice and safe place to live are maintained.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO486	Ms Lynne Boulton				General comment	I have previously commented on the potential significant detrimental impact of this development, on the residents of those properties which back onto the proposed site, and the adjoining area (WE013); also the effect on drainage and the environment around those properties which are adjacent to the field to the rear of the site. The field provides a habitat home to a large number of wildlife species, including owls and badgers, which could be negatively affected. There will be inevitable disruption to us local residents during the development phase (noise, dust and traffic movements) and in future, loss of privacy and open views to the rear of our properties. There will also be a consequent reduction in value of those properties affected. Although there will be less impact on me and my close neighbours from housing in this preferred area, I am particularly concerned about ongoing development 'creep, ie once an access is created to the site, along with the infrastructure to support the properties being built (roadways and utility services), there is nothing to prevent the area expanding over time and occupying more of the open rural land. I would like reassurance that this will not happen. The ground space which will be occupied by this and the adjacent site, will also reduce the gap between our rural village in Staffordshire Moorlands, and the city of Stoke-on-Trent.	• The site is not a designated wildlife site. It was not been assessed in Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2015 if it is taken forward as an allocation consideration will need to be given to the biodiversity of the site. • Problems arising from the construction period of any works, e.g. noise, dust, construction vehicles, hours of working (covered by Control of Pollution Acts) are not material planning considerations • Issues such as overlooking, screening and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application. • Property value is not a material planning consideration • The Local Plan will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policies in Local Plan seek to maintain the character of the area • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
							Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - The Environment Agency consider there are known flooding issues in the area and the Staffordshire Local Lead Flood Authority have it on their records as a flooding hotspot . The EA have requested a level 2 SFRA to be completed if the site is to be considered for allocation. - The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was limited. It recommended that the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt.
PO1180	Ms J Forster				Object	I have just attended a local residents /parish council meeting tonight to discuss the proposed development of 111 houses in Werrington. I wish to support the view put forward at the meeting, that Smdc revisit the previous sites identified and review it's proposals. In particular I object to the development at the back of Ash Bank Road. By allowing this to take place will increase the likelihood that you will allow further development along this stretch of road in the future. Congestion on the A52 is already an issue! Not to mention the greenbelt. A point was raised that the Young Offenders Institute may close in Werrington in the near future. A large area of land will become	- See response to PO486 regarding how the Local Plan would consider the future development and the Green Belt - The Highway Authority considers the site may be acceptable subject to detail of access design and visibility. It would need to be developed with WE013 to be adequate for adoption as highway.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						available.	
PO1188	Mr Darren Williams				Object	I absolutely object to the plans to build houses in Werrington on the A52. My drive is directly accessed from this already dangerous road and I have emailed the County Council many times about my concerns-especially the 40mph limit. The large number of schoolchildren (who are socially urged to walk more) walking on a very narrow footpath (next to the chip shop/Chinese). I urge someone to carry out this task in the flesh as a HGV hurtles past at speed, believe me it is very unnerving! There WILL be an accident, my previous emails have stated this and my concerns are documented. It is only a matter of time. So instead of addressing this and introducing speed calming measures or speed reduction, the bright idea of an additional strain on the very dangerous stretch of road, incredible. Yes, you can then reduce the speed but can you reduce the number of cars? In each direction leaving Werrington, obviously people would HAVE to travel out of the VILLAGE to work, there is severe congestion. Towards Cheadle, Weston Coyney, Leek and in particular Hanley. I see the traffic daily and avoid it if at all possible. Werrington needs traffic REDUCING, not increasing. The obvious strains on doctors, churches, dentist, facilities for young people etc. will be felt but the most interesting strain is the one on schools. Ridiculously, there is currently building work ongoing putting 30 houses where a school used to be! These are not yet completed and the effect and impact of the extra strain on the VILLAGE hasn't yet taken effect. Less than a mile away at Cellarhead, additional "affordable housing" has been built. Most of these have yet to impact the area with additional children. Let's take the 30 houses behind Oak Mount Road, averaging 2.4 children each=132 people, approximately 60 cars. Really, this hasn't even been absorbed into the area yet. How on Earth can the VILLAGE take more and more without monitoring the effect of the already bursting population? I urge someone to queue in the traffic taking children to Moorside High School, then turn around into more traffic to queue through Werrington into Hanley. Then try the walk to school, if you dare. Please document this as an absolute formal objection to these proposals and acknowledge receipt of this prior to the deadline date.	• See response to PO1180 regarding highways • See response to PO486 regarding infrastructure
PO1198	Mr Paul Dean				Object	I object to anymore houses being built in Werrington - it is an act of lunacy and disrespect to the existing residents! The tensions are building up and how much more are we expected to take before matters get out of hand, you have a social responsibility towards us and make our lives bearable. My proposition would be to build an entirely new village, if we really do have to be build in the Moorlands, preferably towards the Tean and Blythe Bridge area by the A50 where there is a large road in place for ease of access and transport. This would then offer people the selection of choice of either accessing Derby and Burton-on-Trent or Stoke	• See response to PO1180 regarding highways • See response to PO486 regarding infrastructure, flooding, • See PO486 how the Local Plan would consider the future development • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						on Trent for retail and employment. It can be seen Stoke on Trent is failing badly and by building houses in Werrington you are isolating them from opportunities, I personally try not to set foot in Stoke-on-Trent any longer and many in the village are of the same opinion. There are far too many houses in Werrington now and this started in the 1980s with the Meigh Road estate and especially in the 1990s when you built the Hill Village Road estate. Even now they are building more houses on the old Werrington First School site, in fact they are squeezing them in, causing a grotesque eyesore - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! The junction at Washerwall Lane is not going to get any bigger and the gridlocks are a daily occurrence and this is not environmentally friendly, the pollution is getting out of hand as the road congestion increases. The A52 down into Stoke-on-Trent is not going to change and it is the same for the A53 from Leek, these roads were put in place a long time ago and there is nothing you can do to enable them to have a larger carrying capacity. Only foolish people will sit around loading data into a computer trying to come up with some solution to later find in practice it fails, this seems to be the approach they take in Stoke-on-Trent. Both the A52 and A53 are operating on maximum capacity and cannot carry anymore vehicles - have you conducted a recent traffic survey? There was no foresight back when they were built to increase capacity, so only the most ignorant of planners will attempt to try anything. Other infrastructure within Werrington is also at capacity such as the Doctors and School and we do not want any more shops or take aways being built here either! If people desire urban living they can go and live in the City - as this is a village. I am also concerned about the rising water table in the village and existing flooding problems as there are Springs everywhere, the road names Draw Well Lane and Washerwall Lane give indication of this. I see no evidence of any hydrological surveys and whether the existing drains can take anymore new builds. To build more houses in the Moorlands around the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is the wrong approach to take for future generations and we will only get sucked into the continuing failures of that City. Although there was recent talk of a boundary change and Werrington becoming a part of Stoke-on-Trent, so if you do decide to build more houses here it may be worth my time to start lobbying for a boundary change. I want to make representation and speak to somebody at the Council as soon as possible regarding this.	assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO1210	Mr Philip Jones				Object	I apologise for the late submission of my concerns regarding one of the proposed sites for housing in Werrington, I have only recently found the leaflet posted to us. I have attempted to use your portal but it appears to be inaccessible. I am writing to raise concerns regarding the proposed site opposite the road Bridal Path and adjacent to 244 Ashbank Road. (Site codes WE013 and WE027). 1) When we bought the house back in 2009 we were	- See response to PO486 regarding flooding - See response to PO1180 regarding highways

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						aware that the house had been subject to at least 2 floods which caused considerable damage to the inside of the property. After an investigation by the council department responsible, it was found that a small brook that runs behind the property had been covered over, with a pipe used to supposedly allow the water to run through. The council took steps to force the land owner to return the brook to its original condition. This seemed to have rectified the issue. 2) The land owner has also applied on a number of occasions to build on this land and it has been refused on both occasions. It seems ridiculous that the council is now looking at adding this site to build houses on. 3) We have issues with our garden being sodden for most of the year and if we now add the addition of more concrete going into the ground as foundations for the properties and the road I am worried that this will only exacerbate the problem. 4) As the number of vehicles on the road have increased over the years we have found it more and more difficult to exit our drive onto the main road, the position of our drive and our neighbours including the proposed exit of the housing development makes it very difficult to view vehicles coming down the bank, also with the business premises directly opposite the new access/exit site we have at present constant near miss accidents with cars pulling onto and off the open car parking area this may be a risk factor you need to consider.	
PO1218	Mrs Elizabeth Holdcroft				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YO1 land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses	• Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable • See response to PO486 regarding flooding • See response to PO1180 regarding highways • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	
PO1246	Mr and Mrs Derek Brindley				Object	My wife and I have just returned from a Public Meeting in discussing plans to build 111 houses in Werrington from now to 2031. We are left with serious concerns after viewing plans of potential sites. We live at Oak Mount opposite a potential site for 50 houses. Whilst we recognise a need of housing we believe strongly they could be better located. We ask that original plans as submitted in September 2015 be reviewed. We OBJECT STRONGLY to current proposals. Our objections include: - all locations feed immediately onto an existing busy main road, the A52 is already difficult to negotiate and overcrowded with heavy vehicles. - there is lacking the infrastructure such as doctors, schooling etc. - further eating away green belt area which would leave it vulnerable for the future and further considerations for development.	- See response to PO1180 regarding highways - See response to PO486 regarding infrastructure and the Green Belt
PO2085	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Support	Support and it is understood that the owner of site WE068 (SHLAA 2015) would release for development. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	- Support noted . - SHLAA site WE068 is located in the Green Belt and identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment as forming important landscape setting to the settlement. It was not taken forward as an option site in the 2015 consultation.
PO2703	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	If it is decided to continue with sites in the floodplain or likely to be following the application of the Sequential Test, then further work in the form of a Level 2 SFRA will be required for the following site: WE027 which along with WE013 is adjacent to Watercourses with no mapped floodplain. This does not mean the site is within Flood Zone 1. It is imperative that the flood risk to these sites is quantified prior to final submission as it may affect the deliverability of the sites, particularly the smaller ones in Werrington. Because in both cases the sites are adjacent to each other, producing one model for each is more cost effective than needing to for individual sites.	Comments noted
PO2575	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Planning Manager Sport England			Object	The proposal appears to lead to the loss of a football pitch and tennis court. This is not in accordance with NPPF 74 unless the sports facilities are going to be replaced. If so this needs to be a requirement in the Local Plan document.	Comments noted.
PO3860	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Support	Confirms that landowner of northernmost section of site has re-affirmed willingness to bring forward site for residential development. Also agrees with recommendations of Green Belt	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Review with respect to WE027. Argues delivery of site is not dependent upon development of WE013.	
PO9344	Mrs Lynne Dodd				Object	In our opinion the house planning proposal for Werrington is unacceptable no green belt should be used for houses. The original proposal for infill should be used. Ideally we do not want to see anymore new buildings as the roads are choked at certain times of the day. The village surgery cannot attract any new doctors waiting times are rising and with more housing can only get worse. We hope this will be taken into consideration after all we have to live here.	- See response to PO486 regarding the Green Belt and infrastructure - See response to PO1189 regarding highways
PO9354	Mr Gavin Walters				Object	Object to development here. Building in line with the road like what currently is in place down the road would be fine. This doesn't effect the boundary, spoil greenbelt areas and over crowd a quiet area in Werrington.	See response to PO 1218 regarding infill sites
PO9360	Ms ROVEINA MITCHELL				Object	Object to this development for the following reasons: Safety: Ashbank road is an incredibly busy road. It's not only used by the residents of Werrington but by commuters travelling to other parts of the area and of course there's the school which attracts high volumes of traffic. The high volumes of traffic makes it difficult to cross the road on regular occasions. I also fear for the safety of children living close by. This can also lead to traffic accidents. Quality of life: This is incredibly important. There are several reasons why Werrington is a desirable place to live. The sense of space is one of those reasons. That's why I believe the proposed areas would be better for the community - the new home quota is met and the sense of space and greenery is maintained. This isn't just about the existing residents but for the new residents too, they should be able to enjoy the same benefits. I moved here from London and the main reason I moved here is because of the sense of space. It's quiet and private, this is so important. Desirability of the area: This is a big factor when it comes to the prosperity of an area. There is always a direct correlation between prosperity and desirability. One of the best things about Werrington is that it actually has a village feel despite being so close to Stoke. By 'filling in the gaps' this will diminish. This will also destroy the spirit of the village. Considering Werrington is so close to Stoke it's very attractive and pleasant. Because Stoke has a history within an industry there is a large volume of social housing, cramped areas and terrace houses. Having places like Werrington helps with the city's overall living standards. It would be a great shame to lose this. I believe Longton was once considered a nice place to live especially as it has large family houses. But as the gaps were filled this destroyed the value of the area. Overcrowding definitely contributes to the demise of an area - another reason why I believe having the new houses spread around is much better. Please keep Werrington as a nice place to live and not just somewhere that used to be nice. Local factors: The roads are in a terrible state - This could only get worse with more houses	- See response to PO1180 regarding highways - See response to PO486 regarding the Green Belt, wildlife and village character

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						squashed along Ashbank road. Green Belts - they are important. Not only for the local community but for local wildlife too. I see several foxes, rabbits, pheasants, numerous birds and several other animals. Because much of the surrounding land is farm land it's important to have something left somewhat wild for animals to live and flourish. House prices will be negatively affected by the district councils proposals. Overall, I understand new houses need to be built due to the demand but please consider carefully where these should be built. By following the parishes proposals you meet the quota and everything which makes the village a nice and safe place to live are maintained.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1172	Mr H Weston				Object	These developments would have a monumental impact on the village. Ash bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside school. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which includes HGV's, Buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington's population is largely made up of older residents more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the Green Belt and on Wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of Natural Beauty with an abundance of Wildlife and feel this needs to be protected. Infill Building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the Green Belt and Village status.	• The Highway Authority has expressed concerns about site access which require consideration to determine whether a solution is possible • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was limited and considered the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. • The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations, the Local Wildlife Assessment (2017) assessed sites to establish their potential SBI/BAS status against Staffordshire Wildlife Trust criteria. They found that the site had low biodiversity value overall with the exception of the trees which may have the potential to support roosting bats and recommended that a bat survey was carried out. • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. • See response to PO1184 regarding noise/pollution.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO1181	Ms J Forster				Object	I have just attended a local residents /parish council meeting tonight to discuss the proposed development of 111 houses in Werrington. I wish to support the view put forward at the meeting, that Smdc revisit the previous sites identified and review it's proposals. In particular I object to the development at the back of Ash Bank Road. By allowing this to take place will increase the likelihood that you will allow further development along this stretch of road in the future. Congestion on the A52 is already an issue! Not to mention the greenbelt. A point was raised that the Young Offenders Institute may close in Werrington in the near future. A large area of land will become available.	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways and Green Belt • The Local Plan will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. • A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.
PO1184	Ms V Williams				Object	I write in reference to the preferred housing sites WE003 and WE052, I am very concerned about the access to these sites being off the A52 Ash Bank Road. Being a resident on this road, it is already difficult enough to get into or out of our drive at times due to the volume and speed of traffic that travels on it. At certain times of day this road is already congested resulting in queuing traffic trying to get into Hanley. We do not have in infrastructure to support these houses in the village, we cannot register at the dentist, it can take 3 weeks to get a drs appointment and the schools are already at capacity. There is not work to support the families that would move into these houses so this would mean more commuters and more congestion which would impact negatively on the existing residents. The traffic noise and pollution would increase and Ash Bank road is noisy enough as it is. We have contacted Staffordshire county council on numerous occasions about our concerns regarding the safety of the 40mph speed limit on this stretch of road as two schools are accessed from it and it is an accident waiting to happen, adding another 75 homes into this area will only make this situation worse. Our war memorial is a place where people can go and reflect and remember our war	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways , wildlife and Green Belt • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						heroes, this building will have a negative effect on this area. These areas are in the greenbelt and I have seen owls hunting on the area of land WE003 we need to protect our wildlife and open spaces in order to maintain the status of our village. During times of adverse weather this area of road becomes treacherous we have regularly seen cars sliding down past HMYOI, this would be even more dangerous with another access road on the left. The safety of the children walking to and from school should be paramount and adding all this extra traffic will have a negative effect on this. I would urge you to look at the parish councils proposed sites again and take into account the views of the local residents as we are the ones who will have to live with the decision that is made. Please consider this a formal objection to these proposed sites.	ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • The Local Plan contains policies regarding heritage assets and the impact on any development on the war memorial will be taken into consideration. • The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution
PO1190	Mr Darren Williams				Object	I absolutely object to the plans to build houses in Werrington on the A52. My drive is directly accessed from this already dangerous road and I have emailed the County Council many times about my concerns-especially the 40mph limit. The large number of schoolchildren (who are socially urged to walk more) walking on a very narrow footpath (next to the chip shop/Chinese). I urge someone to carry out this task in the flesh as a HGV hurtles past at speed, believe me it is very unnerving! There WILL be an accident, my previous emails have stated this and my concerns are documented. It is only a matter of time. So instead of addressing this and introducing speed calming measures or speed reduction, the bright idea of an additional strain on the very dangerous stretch of road, incredible. Yes, you can then reduce the speed but can you reduce the number of cars? In each direction leaving Werrington, obviously people would HAVE to travel out of the VILLAGE to work, there is severe congestion. Towards Cheadle,	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways • See response to PO1184 regarding infrastructure

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Weston Coyney, Leek and in particular Hanley. I see the traffic daily and avoid it if at all possible. Werrington needs traffic REDUCING, not increasing. The obvious strains on doctors, churches, dentist, facilities for young people etc. will be felt but the most interesting strain is the one on schools. Ridiculously, there is currently building work ongoing putting 30 houses where a school used to be! These are not yet completed and the effect and impact of the extra strain on the VILLAGE hasn't yet taken effect. Less than a mile away at Cellarhead, additional "affordable housing" has been built. Most of these have yet to impact the area with additional children. Let's take the 30 houses behind Oak Mount Road, averaging 2.4 children each=132 people, approximately 60 cars. Really, this hasn't even been absorbed into the area yet. How on Earth can the VILLAGE take more and more without monitoring the effect of the already bursting population? I urge someone to queue in the traffic taking children to Moorside High School, then turn around into more traffic to queue through Werrington into Hanley. Then try the walk to school, if you dare. Please document this as an absolute formal objection to these proposals and acknowledge receipt of this prior to the deadline date.	
PO1199	Mr Paul Dean				Object	I object to anymore houses being built in Werrington - it is an act of lunacy and disrespect to the existing residents! The tensions are building up and how much more are we expected to take before matters get out of hand, you have a social responsibility towards us and make our lives bearable. My proposition would be to build an entirely new village, if we really do have to be build in the Moorlands, preferably towards the Tean and Blythe Bridge area by the A50 where there is a large road in place for ease of access and transport. This would then offer people the selection of choice of either accessing Derby and Burton-on-Trent or Stoke on Trent for retail and employment. It can be seen Stoke on Trent is failing badly and by building houses in Werrington you are isolating them from opportunities, I personally try not to set foot in Stoke-on-Trent any longer and many in the village are of the same opinion. There are far too many houses in Werrington now and this started in the 1980s with the Meigh Road estate and especially in the 1990s when you built the Hill Village Road estate. Even now they are building more houses on the old Werrington First School site, in fact they are squeezing them in, causing a grotesque eyesore - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! The junction at Washerwall Lane is not going to get any bigger and the gridlocks are a daily occurrence and this is not environmentally friendly, the pollution is getting out of hand as the road congestion increases. The A52 down into Stoke-on-Trent is not going to change and it is the same for the A53 from Leek, these roads were put in place a long time ago and there is nothing you can do to enable them to have a larger carrying capacity. Only foolish people will sit around loading data into a computer trying	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways • See response to PO1184 regarding infrastructure and flooding • Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area • See response to PO1184 regarding pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						to come up with some solution to later find in practice it fails, this seems to be the approach they take in Stoke-on-Trent. Both the A52 and A53 are operating on maximum capacity and cannot carry anymore vehicles - have you conducted a recent traffic survey? There was no foresight back when they were built to increase capacity, so only the most ignorant of planners will attempt to try anything. Other infrastructure within Werrington is also at capacity such as the Doctors and School and we do not want any more shops or take aways being built here either! If people desire urban living they can go and live in the City - as this is a village. I am also concerned about the rising water table in the village and existing flooding problems as there are Springs everywhere, the road names Draw Well Lane and Washerwall Lane give indication of this. I see no evidence of any hydrological surveys and whether the existing drains can take anymore new builds. To build more houses in the Moorlands around the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is the wrong approach to take for future generations and we will only get sucked into the continuing failures of that City. Although there was recent talk of a boundary change and Werrington becoming a part of Stoke-on-Trent, so if you do decide to build more houses here it may be worth my time to start lobbying for a boundary change. I want to make representation and speak to somebody at the Council as soon as possible regarding this.	
PO1219	Mrs Elizabeth Holdcroft				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YO1 land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses	• Polices in the Local Plan require an element of new housing to be affordable • See response to PO1184 regarding flooding • See response to PO1172 regarding highways and infill development

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	
PO1247	Mr and Mrs Derek Brindley				Object	My wife and I have just returned from a Public Meeting in discussing plans to build 111 houses in Werrington from now to 2031. We are left with serious concerns after viewing plans of potential sites. We live at Oak Mount opposite a potential site for 50 houses. Whilst we recognise a need of housing we believe strongly they could be better located. We ask that original plans as submitted in September 2015 be reviewed. We OBJECT STRONGLY to current proposals. Our objections include: - all locations feed immediately onto an existing busy main road, the A52 is already difficult to negotiate and overcrowded with heavy vehicles. - there is lacking the infrastructure such as doctors, schooling etc. - further eating away green belt area which would leave it vulnerable for the future and further considerations for development.	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways and Green Belt • See response to PO1184 regarding infrastructure
PO1410	Mrs E Weston				Object	We wish to strongly object to the following WE003, WE053, WE052. These developments would have a monumental impact on this village. Ash Bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside School. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which included HGV's buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington population is largely made up of older residents more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the green belt on wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of natural beauty with abundance of wildlife and feel this needs protected. Infill building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the green belt and Village Status	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways, Green Belt, infill development and wildlife • See response to PO1184 regarding noise/pollution.
PO2100	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	Object - would not maintain line of buildings encroaches into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	• See response to PO1172 regarding Green Belt
PO9345	Mrs Lynne Dodd				Object	In our opinion the house planning proposal for Werrington is unacceptable no green belt should be used for houses. The original proposal for infill should be used. Ideally we do not want to see anymore new buildings as the roads are choked at certain times of the day. The village surgery cannot attract any new doctors waiting times are rising and with more housing can only get worse. We hope this will be taken into consideration after all we have to live here.	• See response to PO1172 regarding Green Belt, infill development and highways • See response to PO1184 regarding infrastructure
PO9356	Mr Gavin				Object	Object to development here. Building in line with the road like	• See response to PO1172 regarding the

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
	Walters					what currently is in place down the road would be fine. This doesn't effect the boundary, spoil greenbelt areas and over crowd a quiet area in Werrington.	pattern of development and the need for site allocations
PO9361	Ms ROVEINA MITCHELL				Object	Object to this development for the following reasons: Safety: Ashbank road is an incredibly busy road. It's not only used by the residents of Werrington but by commuters travelling to other parts of the area and of course there's the school which attracts high volumes of traffic. The high volumes of traffic makes it difficult to cross the road on regular occasions. I also fear for the safety of children living close by. This can also lead to traffic accidents. Boundary of the HMYOI: Noise levels are surprising high, I can hear sirens and shouting at all hours. I can imagine this only increasing if houses at situated closer to the detention centre. I also believe this would be rather intimidating/scary for children living in close proximity. I think it's important to have some sort of boundary/space between residential housing and the detention centre. What if something we to go wrong or individuals were to escape. I realise that is an extreme case, but prisoners have escaped from prisons before in Britain so it's something to take into account. Having space (what there is now) in between the detention centre and residential homes increases safety. Extra minutes are vital in dangerous situations. Please take this into consideration! Quality of life: This is incredibly important There are several reasons why Werrington is a desirable place to live. The sense of space is one of those reasons. That's why I believe the proposed areas would be better for the community - the new home quota is met and the sense of space and greenery is maintained. This isn't just about the existing residents but for the new residents too, they should be able to enjoy the same benefits. I moved here from London and the main reason I moved here is because of the sense of space. It's quiet and private, this is so important. Desirability of the area: This is a big factor when it comes to the prosperity of an area. There is always a direct correlation between prosperity and desirability. One of the best things about Werrington is that it actually has a village feel despite being so close to Stoke. By 'filling in the gaps' this will diminish. This will also destroy the spirit of the village. Considering Werrington is so close to Stoke it's very attractive and pleasant. Because Stoke has a history within an industry there is a large volume of social housing, cramped areas and terrace houses. Having places like Werrington helps with the city's overall living standards. It would be a great shame to lose this. I believe Longton was once considered a nice place to live especially as it has large family houses. But as the gaps were filled this destroyed the value of the area. Overcrowding definitely contributes to the demise of an area - another reason why I believe having the new houses spread around is much better. Please keep Werrington as a nice place to live and not just somewhere that used to be nice. Local factors: The roads are in a	• See response to PO1172 regarding highways, wildlife and Green Belt • Any development of this would be required to submit a noise impact assessment to consider the effect of the YOI and any mitigation measures.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						terrible state - This could only get worse with more houses squashed along Ashbank road. Green Belts - they are important. Not only for the local community but for local wildlife too. I see several foxes, rabbits, pheasants, numerous birds and several other animals. Because much of the surrounding land is farm land it's important to have something left somewhat wild for animals to live and flourish. House prices will be negatively affected by the district councils proposals. Overall, I understand new houses need to be built due to the demand but please consider carefully where these should be built. By following the parishes proposals you meet the quota and everything which makes the village a nice and safe place to live are maintained.	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO219	Mr Steve Whiston	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Support	The site's removal from the Green Belt would not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt because it lies between existing houses and would not protrude any further into the Green Belt than the neighbouring houses. Of the ten representations received at the Site Consultation stage nine of them, including the Parish Council, were in support of the proposal.	Comments noted
PO1220	Mrs Y Pointon				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YOI land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	• Policies in the Local Plan require an element of new housing provision to be affordable • The Environment Agency has not identified any site specific issues. They recommend that the ecological value of watercourses is enhanced where possible and the impact on water quality is assessed. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. Mitigation measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent development of this site. They consider individual units may be acceptable fronting onto Ash Bank Road, each unit would require sufficient space to provide turning facilities in addition to parking. Gradients of the drives would need to be agreed. • There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed.
PO1174	Mr H Weston				Object	These developments would have a monumental impact on the village. Ash bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside school. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which includes HGV's, Buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington's population is largely made up of older residents	• See response to PO1120 regarding highways and infill development. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the Green Belt and on Wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of Natural Beauty with an abundance of Wildlife and feel this needs to be protected. Infill Building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the Green Belt and Village status.	or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes was limited and recommended the site could be considered for release under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. The Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey 2015 assessed the present and potential ecological value of the proposed site allocations. It found that the site has low biodiversity value overall in terms of the area.
PO1182	Ms J Forster				Object	I have just attended a local residents /parish council meeting tonight to discuss the proposed development of 111 houses in Werrington. I wish to support the view put forward at the meeting, that Smdc revisit the previous sites identified and review it's proposals. In particular I object to the development at the back of Ash Bank Road. By allowing this to take place will increase the likelihood that you will allow further development along this stretch of road in the future. Congestion on the A52 is already an issue! Not to mention the greenbelt. A point was raised that the Young Offenders Institute may close in Werrington in the near future. A large area of land will become available.....	- The Local Plan will provide certainty for local communities and developers through policies guiding the overall level and location of development. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. - See response to PO11220 regarding highways
PO1191	Mr Darren Williams				Object	I absolutely object to the plans to build houses in Werrington on the A52. My drive is directly accessed from this already dangerous road and I have emailed the County Council many times about my concerns-especially the 40mph limit. The large number of schoolchildren (who are socially urged to walk more) walking on a very narrow footpath (next to the chip shop/Chinese). I urge someone to carry out this task in the flesh as a HGV hurtles past at speed, believe me it is very unnerving! There WILL be an accident, my previous emails have stated this and my concerns are documented. It is only a matter of time. So instead of addressing this and introducing speed calming measures or speed reduction, the bright idea of an additional strain on the very dangerous stretch of road, incredible. Yes, you can then reduce the speed but can you	- See response to PO1220 regarding highways - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						reduce the number of cars? In each direction leaving Werrington, obviously people would HAVE to travel out of the VILLAGE to work, there is severe congestion. Towards Cheadle, Weston Coyney, Leek and in particular Hanley. I see the traffic daily and avoid it if at all possible. Werrington needs traffic REDUCING, not increasing. The obvious strains on doctors, churches, dentist, facilities for young people etc. will be felt but the most interesting strain is the one on schools. Ridiculously, there is currently building work ongoing putting 30 houses where a school used to be! These are not yet completed and the effect and impact of the extra strain on the VILLAGE hasn't yet taken effect. Less than a mile away at Cellarhead, additional "affordable housing" has been built. Most of these have yet to impact the area with additional children. Let's take the 30 houses behind Oak Mount Road, averaging 2.4 children each=132 people, approximately 60 cars. Really, this hasn't even been absorbed into the area yet. How on Earth can the VILLAGE take more and more without monitoring the effect of the already bursting population? I urge someone to queue in the traffic taking children to Moorside High School, then turn around into more traffic to queue through Werrington into Hanley. Then try the walk to school, if you dare. Please document this as an absolute formal objection to these proposals and acknowledge receipt of this prior to the deadline date.	demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO1201	Mr Paul Dean				Object	I object to anymore houses being built in Werrington - it is an act of lunacy and disrespect to the existing residents! The tensions are building up and how much more are we expected to take before matters get out of hand, you have a social responsibility towards us and make our lives bearable. My proposition would be to build an entirely new village, if we really do have to be build in the Moorlands, preferably towards the Tean and Blythe Bridge area by the A50 where there is a large road in place for ease of access and transport. This would then offer people the selection of choice of either accessing Derby and Burton-on-Trent or Stoke on Trent for retail and employment. It can be seen Stoke on Trent is failing badly and by building houses in Werrington you are isolating them from opportunities, I personally try not to set foot in Stoke-on-Trent any longer and many in the village are of the same opinion. There are far too many houses in Werrington now and this started in the 1980s with the Meigh Road estate and especially in the 1990s when you built the Hill Village Road estate. Even now they are building more houses on the old Werrington First School site, in fact they are squeezing them in, causing a grotesque eyesore - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! The junction at Washerwall Lane is not going to get any bigger and the gridlocks are a daily occurrence and this is not environmentally friendly, the pollution is getting out of hand as the road congestion increases. The A52 down into Stoke-on-Trent is not going to change and it is the same for the A53 from Leek, these	• See response to PO1220 regarding highways and flooding • See response to PO1191 regarding infrastructure • Any new development taking place will be subject to policies contained within the new Local Plan, which seek to protect the character of the area • If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the district council continually monitors air quality across the district and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. • There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						roads were put in place a long time ago and there is nothing you can do to enable them to have a larger carrying capacity. Only foolish people will sit around loading data into a computer trying to come up with some solution to later find in practice it fails, this seems to be the approach they take in Stoke-on-Trent. Both the A52 and A53 are operating on maximum capacity and cannot carry anymore vehicles - have you conducted a recent traffic survey? There was no foresight back when they were built to increase capacity, so only the most ignorant of planners will attempt to try anything. Other infrastructure within Werrington is also at capacity such as the Doctors and School and we do not want any more shops or take aways being built here either! If people desire urban living they can go and live in the City - as this is a village. I am also concerned about the rising water table in the village and existing flooding problems as there are Springs everywhere, the road names Draw Well Lane and Washerwall Lane give indication of this. I see no evidence of any hydrological surveys and whether the existing drains can take anymore new builds. To build more houses in the Moorlands around the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is the wrong approach to take for future generations and we will only get sucked into the continuing failures of that City. Although there was recent talk of a boundary change and Werrington becoming a part of Stoke-on-Trent, so if you do decide to build more houses here it may be worth my time to start lobbying for a boundary change. I want to make representation and speak to somebody at the Council as soon as possible regarding this.	
PO1221	Mrs Elizabeth Holdcroft				Object	Having lived in Werrington for most of my life, I have tonight attended a public meeting arranged by Werrington Parish Council to discuss the District Council's proposals for housing in Werrington. I fully accept that additional housing is required in Werrington in the period up to 2031. I would particularly suggest that affordable housing is required for people who grew up in Werrington who want to return here and it would be good if that could be a condition put on some of the properties. However I do have concerns about the sites current being suggested by the Council. It is being suggested that 81 of the proposed houses will be at the "top" of Werrington. This is a very big development in a relatively concentrated area and will therefore intensify any existing issues. - Drainage in Werrington is already an issue and a development of this size will put tremendous pressure on the existing drains. - This will also cause traffic issues in a defined area on what is already a very busy main road. Already the traffic backs up to Johnson Avenue at busy times so this will be exacerbated further. I would like to suggest that any proposals for new housing should spread the developments throughout the village, and that this may be more acceptable to the current residents. A linear development on the YOI land, along the side of the road and in line with the existing houses, would be an	See response to PO1220 regarding affordable housing, flooding, highways and infill development

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						acceptable compromise position between the need for additional houses in Werrington and the views of the local people. I also appreciate that this would not meet the quantity of houses required and therefore I would suggest that other sites in Werrington should be considered so that the impact in any one area is minimised. I realise that there may have to be some use of green belt land - as there is in the Council's own proposals - and would therefore suggest a further linear development at the bottom of Ash Bank (on the northern side of the road in between the existing two rows of houses), with the remainder of the houses being positioned in Clough Lane or in Winterfield Lane - where again the development could be linear rather than a large housing estate.	
PO1248	Mr and Mrs Derek Brindley				Object	My wife and I have just returned from a Public Meeting in discussing plans to build 111 houses in Werrington from now to 2031. We are left with serious concerns after viewing plans of potential sites. We live at Oak Mount opposite a potential site for 50 houses. Whilst we recognise a need of housing we believe strongly they could be better located. We ask that original plans as submitted in September 2015 be reviewed. We OBJECT STRONGLY to current proposals. Our objections include: - all locations feed immediately onto an existing busy main road, the A52 is already difficult to negotiate and overcrowded with heavy vehicles. - there is lacking the infrastructure such as doctors, schooling etc. - further eating away green belt area which would leave it vulnerable for the future and further considerations for development.	• See response to PO1220 regarding highways • See response to PO1191 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO1174 regarding Green Belt
PO2098	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	Support - generally maintains line of buildings and not substantial encroachment into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Comments noted
PO9346	Mrs Lynne Dodd				Object	In our opinion the house planning proposal for werrington is unacceptable no green belt should be used for houses. The original proposal for infill should be used. Ideally we do not want to see anymore new buildings as the roads are choked at certain times of the day. The village surgery cannot attract any new doctors waiting times are rising and with more housing can only get worse. We hope this will be taken into consideration after all we have to live here.	• See response to PO1220 regarding highways and infill development • See response to PO1191 regarding infrastructure • See response to PO1174 regarding Green Belt
PO9357	Mr Gavin Walters				Object	Object to development here. Building in line with the road like what currently is in place down the road would be fine. This doesn't effect the boundary, spoil greenbelt areas and over crowd a quiet area in Werrington.	• See response to PO1220 regarding the need for site allocations
PO9362	Ms ROVEINA MITCHELL				Object	Object to this development for the following reasons: Safety: Ashbank road is an incredibly busy road. It's not only used by the residents of Werrington but by commuters travelling to other parts of the area and of course theres the school which attracts high volumes of traffic. The high volumes of traffic makes it difficult to cross the road on regular occasions. I also fear for the safety of children living close by. This can also lead to traffic	• See response to PO1220 regarding highways and infill development • See response to PO1174 regarding wildlife and Green Belt • See response to PO1201 regarding village character

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						accidents. Quality of life: This is incredibly important There are several reasons why Werrington is a desirable place to live. The sense of space is one of those reasons. That's why I believe the proposed areas would be better for the community - the new home quota is met and the sense of space and greenery is maintained. This isn't just about the existing residents but for the new residents too, they should be able to enjoy the same benefits. I moved here from London and the main reason I moved here is because of the sense of space. It's quiet and private, this is so important. Desirability of the area: This is a big factor when it comes to the prosperity of an area. There is always a direct correlation between prosperity and desirability. One of the best things about Werrington is that it actually has a village feel despite being so close to Stoke. By 'filling in the gaps' this will diminish. This will also destroy the spirit of the village. Considering Werrington is so close to Stoke it's very attractive and pleasant. Because Stoke has a history within an industry there is a large volume of social housing, cramped areas and terrace houses. Having places like Werrington helps with the city's overall living standards. It would be a great shame to lose this. I believe Longton was once considered a nice place to live especially as it has large family houses. But as the gaps were filled this destroyed the value of the area. Overcrowding definitely contributes to the demise of an area - another reason why I believe having the new houses spread around is much better. Please keep Werrington as a nice place to live and not just somewhere that used to be nice. Local factors: The roads are in a terrible state - This could only get worse with more houses squashed along Ashbank road. Green Belts - they are important. Not only for the local community but for local wildlife too. I see several foxes, rabbits, pheasants, numerous birds and several other animals. Because much of the surrounding land is farm land it's important to have something left somewhat wild for animals to live and flourish. House prices will be negatively affected by the district council's proposals. Overall, I understand new houses need to be built due to the demand but please consider carefully where these should be built. By following the parish's proposals you meet the quota and everything which makes the village a nice and safe place to live are maintained.	
PO1411	Mrs E Weston				Object	We wish to strongly object to the following WE003, WE069, WE052. These developments would have a monumental impact on this village. Ash Bank Road at present cannot cope with the existing traffic. At times there is a tailback from Werrington traffic lights to Moorside School. This leads to not being able to enter or exit your own driveway. Also the volume and noise of the traffic which included HGV's buses and other vehicles is horrendous. As Werrington population is largely made up of older residents	• See response to PO1220 regarding highways and infill development • See response to PO1174 regarding Green Belt and wildlife

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						more building and extra road usage would impact on their safety and quality of life. Encroachment on the green belt on wildlife would be unthinkable. We live in an area of natural beauty with abundance of wildlife and feel this needs protected. Infill building would be the more acceptable answer and would, in turn, protect the green belt and Village Status	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO112	Mr Simon Thompson				Object	Site reference WE003 Settlement Werrington and Cellarhead I would like to object to the proposals for the land behind Salters Lane for the following reasons:- * Infrastructure - there is already a problem with queuing traffic at peak times * Infrastructure - there is no access to the site from Ash Bank Road * Infrastructure - the location in relation to local amenities would promote the use of a vehicle rather than walking * Infrastructure - schools, doctors and dentist are full to capacity * Landscape - this is a greenbelt area and I do not agree that the greenbelt boundary should be changed. It is designated greenbelt for a reason. Surely brownfield sites should be developed before even considering changing the greenbelt boundary * Landscape - residents have chosen to live in the area because of the landscape and extensive views (property prices reflect this) * Amenity - proximity of the site to HMYOI	• New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. • The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape and heritage impacts of the development allocations. It found the site was suitable for development in heritage terms. It was of medium landscape sensitivity. It recognised the site forms a gap with the existing development and fits well within the existing settlement pattern. It recommended landscape mitigation on the south-eastern and southern boundaries • Issues such as overlooking and other impacts on existing residents will be assessed in detail once a site layout has been determined at the time a planning application is received and residents will have the opportunity to comment on the content of that application • The site is adjacent to the Young Offenders Institute and a noise impact assessment would be required and possibly a landscape buffer to protect the amenity of proposed sites residents • The land in question is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the overall impact of development on the site on Green Belt purposes moderate. It recommends considering site WE003 for release from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances with the northern part of the site being open space to preserve its openness. The capacity of this site has been lowered from 85 to 50 dwellings to take this into account. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites have been proposed. Prioritising brown field land over greenfield in all circumstances is not part of Government policy
PO487	Ms Lynne Boulton				General comment	While I accept there is need to plan for developments to support expanding populations, my concern is that this will be to the detriment of our rural communities, that there will be planning 'creep' going forward, and loss of open spaces and privacy for long standing residents who have chosen to live in those rural locations.	Comment noted
PO57	Mr Wiggins				General comment	Rural areas should stay as such without them we won't have areas to go to walk .play or enjoy ...does it all have to be built on	Comment noted
PO9519	Miss B Jack				Object	During the last consultation and the consultation held by Werrington Parish Council it was discussed and agreed by the majority of the residents who attended the open meeting, that the development of the land known as WE003 was against the wishes of said residents. Alternative sites were put forward by the Parish Council and also the residents of Werrington, these sites have not been taken into consideration and in some cases have not been correctly investigated for potential development sites, I	A number of sites were dropped from the emerging Local Plan after the Site Options consultation. Not all sites were required to meet the Districts housing requirements. The site options assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						would request the officers involved in the proposed development sites regarding Werrington to actually visit the village and assess what damage would be caused by an on mass development proposal. I would like to propose the parish councils view that the housing allocation can be achieved using infill and modifications to SMDC's proposals. Therefore land to the south of Ash Bank, land on Clough Lane, land at Winterfield Lane etc. could meet the housing allocation without having such a devastating impact upon the Green Belt. Large development like some fifty homes proposed at WE003 should be avoided as they are totally out of character with the surrounding area. Werrington Parish Council's plans therefore must not be ignored again as these plans represent the views of the vast majority of Werrington's residents. The council states in its "obligation to Co operate" policy that working with neighbouring / bordering authorities will be discussed, surely these discussions need to take place prior to land being released from Green belt? SOT have an abundance of brown sites only a mile or two down the road regeneration partnerships should be a priority. The site WE033 at Cellarhead seems to have been dropped, this seems strange as the land has recently started to be developed (3 houses built in the last 12 months), the land owner is known locally as keen to proceed with further development however the council have decided to mark the site as "constrained" even though it is safer and easier to access has this been overlooked by the council as it seems a bit ridiculous to remove something that has already been started?	- The Council has considered the alternative sites suggested in the responses to the previous consultation and where appropriate has included the additional sites in the proposed site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. - The council has a Duty to Co-operate with adjacent Local Planning Authorities and Staffordshire County Council, meeting regularly to discuss future development /growth across the area. - See responses below.
PO9530	Mr Nicholas Harding				Object	During the last consultation and the consultation held by Werrington Parish Council it was discussed and agreed by the majority of the residents who attended the open meeting, that the development of the land known as WE003 was against the wishes of said residents. Alternative sites were put forward by the Parish Council and also the residents of Werrington, these sites have not been taken into consideration and in some cases have not been correctly investigated for potential development sites, I would request the officers involved in the proposed development sites regarding Werrington to actually visit the village and assess what damage would be caused by an on mass development proposal. I would like to propose the parish councils view that the housing allocation can be achieved using infill and modifications to SMDC's proposals. Therefore land to the south of Ash Bank, land on Clough Lane, land at Winterfield Lane etc. could meet the housing allocation without having such a devastating impact upon	See response below

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						the Green Belt. Large development like some fifty homes proposed at WE003 should be avoided as they are totally out of character with the surrounding area. Werrington Parish Council's plans therefore must not be ignored again as these plans represent the views of the vast majority of Werrington's residents. The council states in its "obligation to Co operate" policy that working with neighbouring / bordering authorities will be discussed, surely these discussions need to take place prior to land being released from Green belt? SOT have an abundance of brown sites only a mile or two down the road regeneration partnerships should be a priority. The site WE033 at Cellarhead seems to have been dropped, this seems strange as the land has recently started to be developed (3 houses built in the last 12 months), the land owner is known locally as keen to proceed with further development however the council have decided to mark the site as "constrained" even though it is safer and easier to access has this been overlooked by the council as it seems a bit ridiculous to remove something that has already been started?	
PO2101	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	Other Werrington Sites: WE053 - Object - would not maintain line of buildings and substantial encroachment into Green Belt. WE048 - Support in preference to more intrusive encroachment into the Green Belt. Field in Ash Bank Rd - Support - could be developed maintaining line of buildings with minimal encroachment into Green Belt. Former Builders Yard in Wintersfield Lane - recommend Open space off Whitmore Avenue - infill in preference to encroaching into Green Belt Open space off Radley Way - infill in preference to encroaching into Green Belt (extract only - please read full response submitted). WE033 Support – whilst it encroaches into Green Belt it does not materially involve proximity with other villages.	- WE048 The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It is a sloping site with poor relationship to the existing built development. - Field at Ash Bank Road Brookhouses The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt Review assessed this site as part of parcel C12 which it found makes significant contribution to maintain separation between settlements and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. - Former Builders Yard in Wintersfield The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances. The NPPF allows for limited development on brownfield sites in the Green Belt. - Open space off Radley Way/Whitmore Avenue are proposed as local green space in line with the findings of the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 - WE033 is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Review Study provides a strategic review of Green Belt purposes and a more detailed site-based assessment of land which could be considered for review. The review found that the site was not suitable for release from the Green Belt. Limited development can take place in the green belt provided it is in accord with green belt policy.
PO2102	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	The following response is informed by: (a) A public meeting organised by Werrington Parish Council on September 3rd 2015 attended by over 100 residents, views contained in Site Options Response forms completed by residents and a public meeting held on June 15 th 2016 attended by 150 residents. (b) Concerns were expressed at the June 2016 public meeting that SMDC has, in effect, rejected proposals from the September 2015 public meeting. Especially in relation to proposals for alternative sites. Residents and the parish council question whether the 'consultation' process is nothing more than manipulation. (b) At both public meetings the following were highlighted: any increase in housing would result in a greater population which would exacerbate existing traffic problems (principally during the 'rush hours' especially along Ash Bank Road); existing services such as schools and Doctors Surgery are already at capacity; whilst recognising a need for new housing, wherever possible the Green Belt should be protected, especially from large-scale housing developments; and related, that potential for 'infill' sites be explored together with additional sites in preference to those contained in the Site Options Booklet, even though these might have been discounted during earlier assessments by SMDC.	See responses above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						With regard to suggested sites for housing development within Werrington & Cellarhead Werrington Parish Council acknowledges that whilst SMDC has undertaken assessments of sites which, for whatever reason it has discounted prior to identifying sites in the Site Options Booklet, the parish council believes that several should now be reconsidered based on criteria suggested in (b) on page 1 of this response. Consequently, in its response Werrington Parish Council has merged replies to questions 4a, 4b, 4c and 7a.	
PO2105	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Object	NOTES 1. Whilst recognising that SMDC has engaged in an exhaustive process of identifying suitable sites for future housing development and that Werrington Parish Council's proposals differ in several respects from those identified in the July 2015 and June 2016 Site Options Booklets the parish council's response are informed by local residents attending the public meetings on 3rd September 2015 and June 15th 2016. 2. Reasons given for rejecting alternative sites are, in the main, opinions of SMDC Officers (informed in some cases by advice from consultants). Meaningful consultation suggests that where consultees offer alternative proposals they should be seriously considered. On several of the sites the results of the Parish Council's public consultation 'conflict' with officers opinions about the merits of alternative sites. Taken to its ultimate conclusion, reiterating officers' opinions as reasons why alternatives should not be considered suggests that the consultation exercise is flawed. The Parish Council's own public consultations demonstrate overwhelming opposition to substantial intrusion into the Green Belt, suggesting instead an 'infilling' approach and support for the linear approach along Ash Bank Road and less intrusive encroachment into the Green Belt. SMDC acknowledges that in Werrington the prospect of any significant housing development is impossible without encroaching into the Green Belt. Whilst SMDC acknowledged land off Whitmore Avenue and Radley Way is designated as 'open space', following a meeting with SMDC Officers in December 2015 the parish council was advised that both sites " could be improved in the future ". Consequently it is requested that these sites should now be included as site options in order to reduce encroachment into the Green Belt. Whilst SMDC refers principally to the November 2015 Green Belt Review in rejecting several alternative sites supported in Werrington public consultations neither the opinions of officers or consultants should automatically override residents views, for obvious reasons! For example, local opinion considers 'trading off'	See responses above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Green Belt at the southern end of Ash Bank Road even though, as the Green Belt Review 2015 states, it would result in closer merging of the boundary with Stoke-on-Trent. Interestingly, it appears that the extent of residents' objections to Site WE033 led to its removal as a site option. SMDC rejected development of the derelict builders yard in Winterfield Lane because it is outside of the village/development boundary (but the Green Belt Review recommended extending the boundary for several sites supported by SMDC), in the Green Belt, is relatively isolated from services and earmarked as an employment site. However, local opinion favours this site for housing development as less detrimental to the Green Belt than those identified by SMDC.	
PO3861	Mr Clifton Bradeley				Support	Clarify my wish to have the land beside my business (Sub-4 Ltd) at Cellarhead to be included in the proposed plans for the district of Staffordshire Moorland. I have attached two plans of the field adjacent to the building and carpark, which we would like to be considered for any use i.e. housing or commercial land (for jobs). The land is approximately one acre and would be ideal for development due to its location.	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages. Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan. The Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages. Limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside/Green Belt. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.
PO9658	Mr Robert McGuinness				Object	WE021 - Option Site I am writing on behalf of my clients concerning the latest consultation by SMDC regarding the Site Allocations Development Plans to re-affirm the following: Land off Salters Lane, given the reference WE021 is also available for inclusion within the Council's proposals for Werrington. It is understood that SMDC have removed this site from the latest consultation proposals, but given the recently decided Court of Appeal case of Richborough Estates Partnerships LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government SMDC may wish to reconsider their stance on the matter. In addition the site is readily available for release by my clients, it is in a sustainable locations and reasonably flat, making development costs acceptable to developers.	- The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. Development would significantly alter the settlement edge and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. - The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.
PO1041 PO3910	Mr Grant Anderson	Fradley Estates	Mr Grant Anderson		Object	PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION 4 : LARGER VILLAGES Question 41 The Site Options Consultation Exercise identified a housing requirement for Werrington of 200 houses as part of the Rural Areas wider requirement. However the Preferred	The site was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It was considered there was no suitable access to the site and the site was identified in the L & SCA as forming

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Options Sites and Boundaries Consultations identifies proposed allocations that will deliver 111 dwellings only. It is submitted that Werrington is one of the more sustainable larger villages and that a higher provision than 111 dwellings would be appropriate. We act for Fradley Estates, the owner of land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, Werrington (“the Site”) which is put forward for housing development in this Plan. It is submitted that the Site should be allocated as one of the housing sites in Werrington. It is further submitted that it would be appropriate to increase the provision of housing for Werrington from 111 to 200. Site Information Site location: Land off Tregaron Court and Langton Court, Werrington – see plan attached. Site Area (ha) About 4.45 ha (including the woodland belts to the north west boundary). Current & most recent land use Agriculture (relatively low value grazing/hay production). Description of site Greenfield Site features The south east boundary of the Site is formed by the rear boundary fences of houses in Tregaron Court, Weston Close, Ferndale Close and Langton Court. The north west boundary is a natural and defensible boundary formed by a stream course. Further east, this stream course forms part of the Green Belt boundary. The south west boundary is formed by mature woodland vegetation comprising a substantial hedgerow and hedgerow trees with associated bridleway. The bridleway lies outside the site. Again, a strong defensible boundary. The north east boundary is represented in part by the stream course referred to above but in the main by the rear of dwellings fronting Uplands Croft. The Site is well contained visually by the hedgerow and hedgerow trees to the bridleway and by a substantial belt of woodland trees near the stream course. The Site is greenfield in character but has not been put to intensive agricultural use, merely used for grazing or for a hay crop. The Site is assessed as being of relatively low ecological value. Available means of access into the site Appropriate access to the Site is available from Tregaron Court and/or Langton Court. Land at the end of both these cul-de-sacs is retained by Fradley Estates following the construction of the adjacent housing estate and these roads were designed to accommodate future housing development beyond. The attached plan demonstrates the extent of the freehold ownership of Fradley Estates. Short term licences have been granted to adjacent householders to temporarily use the land at both points of access so that the land remains available for access purposes for housing development. A highway report by Sanderson Associates was submitted to the Council in	important landscape setting. It is understood access to the site maybe able to be achieved from Tregaron Court. The site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Appraisals 2016 found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						December 2015 which concludes that access can be provided to serve the development of the Site which meets all current highway guidwlinwes. Availability of utilities and services All necessary utilities including potable water, foul and surface water drainage, gas, electricity, telecoms etc are available at the periphery of the Site and can be easily extended into the Site to facilitate development. Drainage connections are already available on-site. Public Right of Way/ Peripheral Planting The public right of way (outside the Site) which follows the south west boundary of the Site with hedgerows and hedgerow trees is located on the periphery of the Site and with vehicular access available elsewhere, neither the public right of way nor associated hedgerows and hedgerow trees will constrain the layout or development of the Site. Indeed, it is proposed that both features will be retained/enhanced and incorporated into the development of the Site – see the Concept Layout appended to the Bright & Associates landscape Evidence Report 2015. Constraints The Site is not at risk of flooding; there is no known land contamination; foul and surface water drainage etc is available; the Site is assessed as being of low ecological value; there is no known archaeological or heritage constraint and therefore there are no major impediments to the early development of this Site. Availability The Site and its points of access are wholly owned by Fradley Estates a development company which is of long standing and skilled in bringing forward land for housing development. Fradley Estates has been responsible for building a significant proportion of the existing housing in Werrington and is therefore very familiar with the locality and has a proven track record of delivery. Fradley Estates is willing and able to bring the Site forward for housing in the short term with a projected yield beginning within 5 years. Supporting comments Although the Site is located within the Green Belt, visually, it is well contained by the natural features that are the stream course and in particular by the well established tree belts and hedgerows on the Site periphery and outer boundary. The north east boundary of the Site is formed in part by existing housing development and in part the stream course which forms the outer boundary of the Site. A precedent has therefore been set for the use of this stream course as a defensible green belt boundary. A Landscape Evidence Report by Bright & Associates was submitted to the Council on behalf of Fradley Estates in December 2015 (“LER”). In the context of the need to find housing in a sustainable larger village such as Werrington, it is inevitable that Green Belt land will be	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						required. THE LER concluded that in landscape and visual terms the Site is visually well contained and that in terms of the Green Belt, allocation of the Site would be less damaging to the Green Belt than many of the sites considered by the Council including the preferred options. Fradley Estates and its advisers met with Mark James and Pranali Parikh in April 2016 to discuss the Site. It was agreed at that meeting that the Site had been incorrectly classified in the SHLAA as a category C site due to the Council's misunderstanding of the access position and the incorrect assumption that access was not available. It was accepted that the Site should have been classified as category B in which case it would have been the subject of a more detailed review together with other potential sites for Werrington. It was agreed that the Site had "some catching up to do" and that Fradley Estates would submit further information in support of the Site addressing the Council's strategic Green Belt review, the Council's review of the historic landscape and the sustainability of the Site. A further report has been prepared by Bright & Associates which considers the Site and other potential sites in Werrington including the preferred options in terms of landscape and visual impact and Green Belt, which addresses any effects on the historic landscape and which assesses the sustainability of the Site. A copy of that report which also appends the earlier LER and Sanderson Associates highway report is submitted with these representations by way of separate email. It is clear from the June 2016 Bright & Associates report that:- the development of the Site will have no adverse effects on the historic landscape. the Site is more visually contained than the preferred sites for Werrington and that the allocation of the Site will improve the current sharp edge between housing and field space along the southern boundary of the Site. the Site has advantages over other sites in terms of not compromising the openness of the countryside and in visual terms it does not form part of the Green Belt. the development of the Site would meet the three dimensions of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also clear from the above, that the Site has no technical constraints which would affect its delivery - indeed as stated above, the Site is owned by a developer with a proven track record of delivery in Werrington who is keen to bring the Site forward. The same cannot be said of other potential sites in Werrington (including the preferred options). Furthermore, it is considered that rather than allocate a number of relatively	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Obejct/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						small capacity sites in Werrington as in the case of the preferred options, the allocation of a relatively large site is preferable. The reasons for this include:- The Site is likely to have less impact in landscape and visual impact terms and less perceived impact on the Green Belt than sites currently under consideration. A larger site in the hands of a developer is more likely to deliver and, thereby, deliver a substantial element of the housing requirement for Werrington. A larger site such as the Site is more able to deliver affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions. On the other hand, some of the smaller sites will not be able to carry affordable housing requirements and other infrastructure contributions and so a relatively large site such as the Site is preferable in delivering overall on Development Plan objectives for sustainability. Fradley Estates also owns an area of land off Hillside Road, Werrington which could be brought forward in conjunction with the development of the Site for the delivery of open space and /or low cost housing. It is also submitted that the location and characteristics of the Site mean that a development of the Site would from a qualitative and marketing perspective be better than the Council's preferred options which locate development around the HMYO institution. We promote SHLAA sites WE042 and WE043 for residential development. [The 14 submitted attachments examine the suitability of these sites for residential development and for inclusion as housing Preferred Options/release from Green Belt].	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO198	Mrs Sue Highton				General comment	Seems to be the most sensible and least visually disturbing location but access would need to be designed carefully - access would have to be to Mill Lane which is quite steep in this area and close to the existing highway junction.	Comments noted
PO1397	Mrs K Bills				Support	We are writing to add out approval of the development pan (preferred option site allocations and boundaries) for Wetley Rocks	Comments noted
PO2037	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Object	Site WR015 The site lies within the Green Belt and the Council cannot support this site for a development of 20 houses as there is ample room for infill down the lane.	The land in question is mostly within the Green Belt. In order for Wetley Rocks to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary will need adjustment as there are not enough sites in the existing settlement boundary to accommodate the level of development needed. The Council has recently completed a Green Belt Review in order to assess parts of the Green Belt where minor adjustments can be made without having an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole (as defined in government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site WR015 for release from the Green Belt.
PO2511	Mr D Hartley				Object	You have enlarged this site in spite all of our local worries about the traffic measures at that part of Mill Lane	The Highways Authority advises that there would be visibility requirements at Leek Road junction but otherwise; do not rule out the development of this site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Office Response
PO2036	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddlet on Parish Council			Support	Site WR002 outline planning permission has already been granted and the Council support and accept that this site is suitable for the proposed development and should form part of the new S.M. Local Plan.	Allocation of the site is not needed as the site lies within the existing development boundary and the southern part already has permission
PO2510	Mr D Hartley				Object	WR002 - Outline planning permission has already been granted and I support and accept that this site is suitable for the proposed development and should form part of the forthcoming new SM Local Plan.	See response above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support / Object / General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1094	Mr D Cotton				General comment	Whiston needs starter homes for the young.	• Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable
PO835	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	I hope that SMDC will take more notice of the local residents this time, as opposed to the consultation on the Core Strategy, where minimal development was voted by 80%, but was ignored by SMDC despite this.	• Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation. The Council must balance this evidence against all the other evidence relating to this site and reach a decision on whether or not to include it as a development site in the Local Plan.
PO3856	Mr H Wainscott	HLW Developments Ltd			Support	Whiston WH002 - support. Phase 2 of old copperworks site. Development of brownfield SHLAA site - would remediate contaminated site. Please refer to attached letter.	• Support noted
PO3248	Mrs I Richardson		Mr Rob Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy	Object	WH016 (summary only - please see full representation attached) Do not agree with the site being a 'reserve site' for the following reasons: vehicular access is unsuitable; highway safety concerns; substandard access onto the A52; and Phase 1 habitat survey identifies the need for further surveys and mitigation may be required.	• The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan
PO3216	Mrs I Richardson		Mr Rob Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy	Object	WH015 and WH018 (summary only - please see full representation attached) Local Authority do not consider it necessary to formally allocate a site in Whiston. The infill boundary as currently drawn will not deliver sufficient opportunities to deliver growth. WH015 and WH018 are less visually conspicuous than other sites. WH018 is in keeping with the established morphology of the village, enclosed by existing development (to the north). Village hall lies to the south with a play area to the SE. Relates well to the existing settlement and facilities. No technical reasons why site could not be developed and service connections are available. The site at the 'Copperworks' was granted outside of the proposed plan period and should not address the identified need. Revised proposed infill boundary to include WH015 and WH018.	• The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan

Question 33: Do you have any comments on the village boundaries for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Alton								
PO428	Mr David John Allen				Alton	Support	Look fine.	Support noted.
PO1342	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Alton	Support	We support the proposed Village boundary.	Support noted.
PO1614	Mrs Diana Gardner				Alton	Support	I would like to register my support for the proposed village boundary, which maintains most of the current village boundary. I feel that it is for the council to protect the rights of local people who bought homes in good faith wanting to enjoy life in a small rural community. Knowing that there was a village boundary would have given them the peace of mind that certain areas would not be built on. I feel it is wrong to now change these boundaries. The home owners should be allowed to have a peaceful life without out the threat of noise, disruption, loss of light which will be caused by development etc. Developers must not be allowed to develop green field sights in order to make money at the expense of the other residence of the village. There are few jobs and little public transport in this area to support new residence	Support noted.
PO1616	Reg & Janet Moss				Alton	Support	We would like to agree with the proposed plan of the village, No more new housing developments. They are not needed, the infrastructure will not cope with anymore, facilities are nil what is required is transport for the people without cars , toilets for people passing through and pavements to enable us to walk around. Most of all we need something to slow down the traffic going through the village, especially on the road from Uttoxeter to Cheadle.	Support noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1609	Mr Charles Harris				Alton	Support	I am writing to formally submit my comments on the above consultation. While some comments relate to the plan as a whole, my primary focus is on the village of Alton. I endorse and support this proposal the village boundary shown on the site plan for Alton i.e. identified within the consultation draft of the proposed village boundary, in so far as it restates the existing boundary amended for the inclusion of the site AL012 (for which planning permission for 18 dwellings has been granted). I wish to make it clear that I would not support the inclusion of any further sites (reserve sites) for Alton in the local plan. In addition to site AL012 there have been a number of recent building completions. I am aware of further new infill builds that are planned (some already having planning permission) within the existing village boundary which can be expected to add more than 10 dwellings to the existing housing stock. I am firmly of the view that Alton with a population of c1000 already has a more than adequate 5 year forward supply of housing and I can see no reason whatever for any further sites to be added outside of the revised village boundary. There are serious concerns about infrastructure and sustainability that naturally limits other than modest growth of this village. This plan as currently set is a sustainable plan that will ensure that the need for new housing in Alton for the next 30 years is satisfied through availability of appropriate sites encompassed by the proposed village boundary as described above. On this basis I support this plan for Alton village.	Support noted.
PO4711	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			Alton	Support	The proposed village boundary for this part (Gallows Green) of Alton is supported.	Support noted.
PO9552		Alton Orchard Action Group	Mr M Sutcliffe		Alton	Support	Summary - see attached Housing Site Option AL024 Alton Orchard Action Group (AOAG) was formed with the aim of securing the future of the last traditional orchard in Alton. The site was previously identified as a housing option and although not a preferred housing allocation it is coded as a possible reserve site. AOAG supports the proposed development boundary in Tythe Barn, which includes only the cottage and its amenity space within the village and the bulk of the site and orchard in the open countryside. Support the exclusion of AL024 from the preferred sites and the retention of the development boundary as it affects the site.	Support for boundary noted.
Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook								

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO65	Mr Steve Hollinshead				Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Object	Very difficult to comprehend the massive development planned for the Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge area given the vast area of the Staffordshire Moorlands. (Amended) We live less than 3 miles from the most impoverished city in the country with thousands of hectares of brownfield sites available for desperate development for both housing and industry. Yet the government and local authority deem it necessary to build on green belt land. What sort of a backward looking establishment are we. Even the local MP Bill Cash has expressed his concerns regarding the proposed development. The BB041 area earmarked for housing is untenable due to the following. 1. Caverswall Road is way too narrow to incorporate a junction- Road widening would be required including the installation of a footway for residents safety. This would require the removal of a hedgerow and long established trees with TPO on them. Environmental impact on local wildlife population. 2. Current infrastructure is not up to specification the current combined sewer on Caverswall Road overflows regularly at present following the tarmac car park installation at Foxfield Railway, the removal of green belt land will exacerbate this problem. 3.Existing Overhead power lines will require diverting. 4.What survey has proved the need for such a development given my first statement. And finally the proposed installation of a gypsy camp is the icing on the cake. I have friends who live on Uttoxeter road literally 30 metres away - put yourself in their shoes prior to ticking any box. I've previously had lots of faith in SMDC compared to other poor performing authorities this will test my faith in you as an organisation. Who do you put first the local residents who pay for you to exist or a bullying government which is clueless when it comes to understanding local communities passion and resilience regarding unjustified local development.	See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO249	Mr John Dougherty	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Support	THEPROPOSED VILLAGE BOUNDARY TO THE WEST OF CAVERSWALL ROAD AND THE REAR OF 73 CAVERSWALL ROAD I write on behalf of my client supporting the proposed Village Boundary to the west of Caverswall Road and the omission of Site BB086 from the proposed housing allocations. The reasons for my client's support of the proposed boundary and the omission of housing site BB086 were set out in a letter dated 7 September 2015. In brief the reasons are: - • The access to site BB086 is poor. • Development to the west of the proposed Village Boundary would have as profound adverse impact on the green Belt because the land is highly visible from the south-west and the north-west. • The Council's Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment identifies the need for tree planting on the western boundary of the houses on Caverswall Road. • There are better sites elsewhere in the village. • In addition, the recent review of the Green Belt commissioned by the Council does not recommend release of the land from the Green Belt because it considers that development would be an arbitrary extension into open countryside in a significantly sensitive area.	Comments noted. BB086 was included as a possible housing options site but not included as a preferred housing site in the 2016 preferred options sites and boundaries consultation.
PO873	mr jonathan broadhurst				Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Object	Changing the boundaries in this way will merge the villages of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook into one large sprawling site as opposed to two separate smaller villages with their own identities.	Comments noted.
PO878	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Object	Changing the boundaries risks the two villages merging into one large residential area. They should remain as two separate areas.	Comments noted.
PO885	Miss Emily Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Object	The boundaries are starting to merge into one village. We need to keep our villages separate and avoid developing them into mass residential areas.	Comments noted.
PO892	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Object	The boundaries need to keep the villages separate. There is a danger that they will all merge into one large residential area.	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1408	Mrs R Brough				Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Support	We are writing about the land BB027, that the moorlands are thinking of bringing it out of the greenbelt. This position of this land is ideal for families due to the local amenities of nursery's, schools, many useful transport links and local shops. East midlands are 45mins away. The countryside would not be tarnished by this sit being developed as the footpath runs alongside the site leads into vast countryside of Caverswall. We do understand that some of the local residents would object to this development, but feel this would have a minimum impact, as neighbours opposite are 35meters away from the boundary and have hedges and gates off 7ft high. We feel that this area would benefit due to the lack of affordable housing. Developing the site would provide this sort of housing to give the younger generation a greater chance to live a better lifestyle, which this area can provide. We would like to thank you for the opportunity to put our opportunities forward	Comments noted. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The sites were assessed taking into account the consultation responses and evidence relating to the site. The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses .
PO9943	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Blythe Bridge & Forsbrook	Support	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: St Modwen welcome the inclusion of their site within the Village Boundary, in the Preferred Options. The Village Boundary is constrained by the Local Plan Administrative Boundary to the west, and Green Belt to the North West, North, and East. The A50 forms a strong barrier to the south of the settlement, through to the roundabout with the A50/A521. The St Modwen site, and third party land to the south of the A50, south west of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, form a significant area of land that is not constrained by designations, e.g. Green Belt. St Modwen's land extends primarily to the north A50 and is a natural extension of the settlement. The site has previously been identified as suitable for development within the adopted Core Strategy (2014) and the Local Plan (1998). St Modwen remain supportive of the site being identified for development, and within the village boundary. Given the need for housing within Staffordshire Moorlands and the suitability of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook as a location for new housing, St Modwen consider this supports a case for the identification of Blythe Vale as a mixed use development site.	Support for the proposed development boundary noted. See response to Question 39 – comments on the Northern Gateway Opportunity Site.
Brown Edge								
PO49	Mr P Rushton				Brown Edge	General comment	The Brown Edge village boundary could be tweaked in places to enable sympathetic in-filling of houses to cater for local family needs for affordable homes.	Brown Edge is surrounded by Green Belt and the village boundary follows the edge of this designation. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. The NPPF does allow for limited affordable housing for local community needs in the Green Belt under policies set out in the Local Plan.
PO94	MRS DONNA JONES				Brown Edge	Object	The preferred chosen area is a unrealistic option that will endanger the lives of car uses and walkers. The access route to this area will not be able to cope with potentially 50 houses being built. The lane is used by school children walking to Endon High School, parents with pushchairs, there are no pavements and an increase in the flow of traffic will be a catastrophe, and a life will be lost. Accidents have already occurred on this lane and there is signs to say that the lane cannot be used by heavy vehicles, but it is, and again provides a risk to life. The existing school will not be able to cope with additional numbers and is of a poor standard, neither will the existing GP facility. The landowner may be willing to sell but this is not justification for a decision to build houses on a piece of land that is totally inadequate.	See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BE041.
Cheddleton								
PO1	Mr Peter Blakeman				Cheddleton	Object	Greenbelt areas were created to stop neighbouring towns merging into one another. If the proposed sites CD002 and CD003 are used this removes any discernible boundary between Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton removing the original character of the separate towns. These two sites are also outside of the current village boundary and therefore should not be considered for development. Sites within the current boundary should be used to maintain smaller town characteristics.	See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.
PO276	Mrs Shirley Sugars		Mr Paul Sugars		Cheddleton	Object	The adoption of sites CD002 and CD003 would require the extension of the Cheddleton South village boundary towards Wetley Rocks which would undermine the distinct geographical boundaries of these two settlements. Adoption of sites CD098, CD099 and CD088 would yield nearly as many dwellings without the need to extend the village boundary at all. The settlement on Cheadle Road between Cheddleton North and South appears to now be included as part of the village boundary. This is a retrograde step as it could act as a development "bridge" between Cheddleton North and South and ultimately lead to the merging in due course of these two separate and distinct settlements.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO319	Mr Greg Bicker				Cheddleton	Object	The village boundary of Cheddleton is merging with Wetley Rocks due to the allocation of CD002 and CD003, this only lengthens the village rather than bring the two distinct areas of Cheddleton closer together with infill sites (such as CD015, CD115 and CD017).	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.
PO215	Mr Steve Wood				Cheddleton	Object	333 Cheadle road. Our house is circled as being included in the village boundary but our full plot is not. The land and garden with our house runs along side the plots of CD017/ CD019 and up to Pointon park. As the plot has always been the same since approximately the year 1850 and as they have always belonged together, then I think the whole plot should be included in the boundary. I don't think it's right that half of my house will be in the village and half won't be included.	The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. Cheddleton is surrounded by Green Belt and it is proposed that the village boundary follows the edge of this designation. It is proposed to delete earlier proposed extensions to the village boundary such as this, as the site is 'washed over' by the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.
PO218	Mr Andrew Smith	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Cheddleton	Object	127 STATION ROAD, CHEDDLETON On behalf of my client I object to the omission of the houses – no's 81-205 Station Road, Cheddleton – north of Station Road from the proposed Village Development Boundary. The reasons for objecting to the exclusion of the above houses and gardens are: The houses on the north side of the road are well established with many dating back to the Victorian period and some to the late twentieth century. A reasonable person would consider these houses as being an integral part of the village. They are opposite a major industrial estate and are part of the same built-up area of the village. Many of the gardens here contain sheds, greenhouses and polytunnels and the houses and gardens here are part of the village townscape and are not rural in appearance but are part of the village fabric. Some of the houses have gardens separate from them running along the back of other gardens. For instance to the north of Mr Smith's garden is a garden belonging to a house to the east. A recent High Court judgement (Dartford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government concluded that the definition of "previously developed land" (brownfield land) only excludes residential gardens if they are in built-up areas. It follows based on this judgement that rural residential gardens are previously developed land and that both the houses and associated gardens north of Station Road are previously developed land. It is therefore logical and reasonable to include them in the village Development boundary. This part of Station Road is within the 30mph speed limit which is often used as rule of thumb measure for deciding where a village begins and ends. The proposals for Cheddleton	The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. Cheddleton is surrounded by Green Belt and it is proposed that the village boundary follows the edge of this designation. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to remove this section from the Green Belt and therefore it is not proposed to amend the village boundary either.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							include a smaller group of houses on the western side of Cheadle Road to the south of the Main part of the village. There are also two smaller discrete groups of houses within the proposed Village Development boundary which are much further away from the main village area than the houses on Station Road. It does not seem reasonable or logical to exclude the houses north of Station Road whilst smaller discrete groups of houses on Cheadle Road to the south of the main part of the village are included within the proposed development boundary. Ken Wainman [Refer to attached map suggesting amendments to proposed Cheddleton boundary].	
PO528	Mrs V Millar				Cheddleton	Object	The area identified within the Cheddleton plan CD017 does not account for the fact that this is a relatively small space but provides a standard of rural location for those houses located in front of planned area. It seems that as there are fewer households involved the position has been taken that their rural area is not considered on the same level as the area around the cricket ground or other locations which have been removed from the plans.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD017.
PO583	Mrs Susan Buxton				Cheddleton	Object	I strongly object to any development of sites CD002 and CD003 which are outside the village boundary. Altering the boundary to include these sites would link Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks, constituting further urban sprawl and meaning there would be no defined boundary or natural gateway between the two villages. I would strongly support the recent application by John Pointon and Sons to vary the planning obligation of June 2010 and would urge the Council to allow development of what is already a brownfield site, known locally as Staffordshire Farmers, which would significantly contribute to the number of developments required by SMDC without having to alter the village boundary.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.
PO587	Mrs Susan Buxton				Cheddleton	Object	I strongly object to any development of sites CD002 and CD003 which are outside the village boundary. Altering the boundary to include these sites would link Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks, constituting further urban sprawl and meaning there would be no defined boundary or natural gateway between the two villages. Cheddleton is already a very large, sprawling village and this would only increase the sprawl. I would strongly support the recent application by John Pointon and Sons to vary the planning obligation of June 2010 and would urge the Council to allow development of what is already a brownfield site, known locally as Staffordshire Farmers, which would significantly contribute to the	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							number of developments required by SMDC without having to alter the village boundary.	
PO931	Mr John Buxton				Cheddleton	Object	I strongly object to any development of sites CD002 and CD003 which are outside the village boundary. Altering the boundary to include these sites would link Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks, constituting further urban sprawl and meaning there would be no defined boundary or natural gateway between the two villages.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 & CD003.
PO2516	Mr D Hartley				Cheddleton	Support	The council fully supports the extension of the village boundary to include the properties on the west side of the A520 Cheadle Road, which includes the land end of the property adjacent to the land known as Staffordshire Farmers site. The land known as the Staffordshire Farmers site is a brownfield site, it has a established access onto highway and I therefore ask for the 106 agreement place on it to be removed and for it to be included to form part the forth coming new SM local plan as it will satisfy and meet the needs of the settlements requirements. I must also point out that the local council has identified a much more sensible site for any major developments of the village, and that is on the land immediately south of the estate served by Boucher Road, west of the A520 and east of Ostlers Lane. This would just enlarge the built area of the village, and not join settlements together. It would provide an adequate situation for further housing needs as they emerge. It would be by local people and not by an external body such as green belt review body.	Support noted. An application for residential development has been approved by planning committee (subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement) for the Staffordshire Farmers site (Jan 2017).
PO4499	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			Cheddleton	Support	The revised village boundary around Cheddleton is supported. The proposed village boundary will allow for infill housing within a clearly defined and defensible Green Belt and settlement boundary. [Refer to Question 1 attachments].	Support noted.
PO6937	Ms Joanne Harrison				Cheddleton	Object	I have also attached a plan of Cheddleton which shows again in red one area of land that I am asking could be included in the village boundary. Land is located at Basford Bridge and adjacent to the canal. Currently designated as visual open space.	The proposed development boundary has been extended out to Station Road which includes this area.
Cresswell								
PO1030	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Alton	Object	Cresswell and Draycott are not listed here and yet they have a major development included on the site allocations plan and 168 houses that are also NOT in the site allocations plan, therefore comments have been restricted by SMDC. The planning application for these two developments is under police investigation and we are awaiting a report from the Government	This site has outline planning approval. Committed sites will be shown on the proposals map.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Ombudsman regarding the passing of application SMD/2014/0576.	
Endon								
PO60	Ms Wendy Birks				Endon	Support	I think the revised green belt boundary is appropriate at present.	Support noted.
PO316	Mr Robert G McCraith				Endon	Object	Endon is also known as Endon Basin. If you put a plug (houses and concrete) in the bottom of the basin, then you will obviously cause flooding. Because the plug (houses) is at the bottom of the basin, the flood water will have no where to go but will rise, thereby flooding more and more houses. Building on higher ground makes more sense, but build with feeders to take the water away from the properties below. This could be done in an attractive way and would help in keeping Endon flood free!	Comments noted. The Council has completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the District, the results of which have been used to inform the site selection process.
PO1052	Mr Stuart Davies				Endon	Object	Endon is already too big and functions partly as a village and partly as a suburb of Stoke. Enlarging the village further will only worsen this. More space for infill should be found rather than building on green belt land and elongating the village.	Comments noted. The housing requirement for the rural area makes an allowance for small windfall sites.
PO419	Mr & Mrs S and S Gibbins	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Endon	Object	SHLAA SITE EN030 – THE VILLAGE, ENDON ST9 9EX On behalf of my clients I object to the omission of the potential residential site SHLAA EN030 from the preferred allocated sites; the site remaining in the Green Belt; and the proposed village boundary. It is appreciated that the site submitted in the Site Options Consultation did not have a good access. The County Council's Highway officer for the District indicated that it was not possible to achieve adequate visibility sight-lines from the proposed access to the west of the house, Meadow Cottage and that the road, The Village, would need to be widened. The Highway Engineer (the email from the engineer will be sent by email) considered that EN030 and EN125 – the field to the west – would need to be developed together and that to achieve adequate visibility about 100 metres of hedge would need to be removed. Following this an alternative scheme was submitted on 9 November 2015 after the consultation had ended which set out a proposal which would overcome the sight-line issues; avoid the removal of any significant length of hedgerow and allow the widening of the eastern part of the road, The Village, using my client's land. A location plan showing the site was sent to the Council in November 2015. The Council replied that they could not consider the alternative as the site consultations period had ended and that the next occasion when the site could	Comments noted. Responses to the comments received to the Site Options consultation in 2015 were reported to the Council Assembly on 13 April 2016 and are available on the Council's website. The sites were assessed taking into account the consultation responses and evidence relating to the site. The site assessments provided a summary of the key issues and responses .

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							be considered was in April 2016 when the preferred sites consultation would take place. The email dated 29 the November 2015 will be sent as a separate email as will a location plan (Drawing No.SOP16-01), showing the potential site. Mr. and Mrs. Gibbins are willing to add the existing house and surrounding buildings to the site. This would enable a new access road with satisfactory sight-lines to be provided on the site of the existing house and also enable the widening of the road and the possible provision of a pavement on the north side of the road. There is opportunity to move the possible access further east The eastern part of my clients land is flood zone (Category 2). However, the Environment Agency flood map shows the existing house and the garden to the east outside the nearby flood zone. The eastern part of the site is in the flood zone but it is possible that the land on which these buildings stand could be developed as my clients own the land upstream where it might be possible to provide flood attenuation and it would also be possible to design the housing scheme incorporating flood protection. If the Council did not wish the area to the east to form part of the site the reduced site would consist of EN030 plus the house and garden up to the red dash line on the plan. My clients ask that this alternative site is considered as part of this consultation and that the proposed village boundary is amended to include it. The reasons for objecting to the exclusion of the site are: It is contended that the two sites (EN030 and EN125) are not necessarily linked and that Site EN030 can be developed separate from Site EN125. The narrow width of the road near Site EN125 may prevent it being developed. However, the road in front of Site EN030, when measured on an Ordnance Survey map, has a minimum width of at least 6.1 metres which is greater than the Highway Engineer's requirement of a minimum width of 5.5 metres. A scheme could be designed so that all traffic exits and enters the site either from or towards the main road. This can be achieved by curving the access towards the main road and by the use of safety kerbs. Mr and Mrs Gibbins own the land north of the road from the drive to the two houses, Daisy Bank and Middle Meadow House in the west all the way eastwards past their house and outbuildings to the main road in the east. It would therefore be possible to provide a 2m wide pavement along the front of any development on the site and also possible to re-site the access to the possible development further east than originally suggested in	

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							order to achieve adequate visibility. Drawing No.SOP16-01, which will be submitted separately by email, shows a possible access in front of the existing house but this access could be moved further eastwards if required to reduce the amount of hedge to be lost. Drawing No.SOP2016-01 shows a pavement along the entire frontage of the suggested site but the pavement does not necessarily need to go along the entire frontage of the development site; it could be restricted to lengths either side of the road access. In this way the hedge to the west of the existing house could be retained as part of a possible development. Reducing the amount of pavement would also allow the retention of two mature deciduous trees, protected by Tree Preservation Order, on the road frontage to the west of the existing house. 2. The site could be available for development in the next 2-3 years; possibly less. 3. The Council's SHLAA identified the site as suitable for appropriate residential development and that development would be economically viable. 4. The site is semi-improved grassland poor in flowering species. 5. The Green Belt Review commissioned by the Council assessed the two sites, EN030 and EN125, together and considered that although the sites are relatively well enclosed the two sites maintain a significant role in maintaining the open character of the northern part of the village. The Review does not recommend the release of the two sites from the Green Belt. As suggested above Site EN030 could be developed alone and if this were the case there would be clear views through into the countryside from the western and eastern sections of road and in this way development on Site EN030 would appear as part of the countryside and the Green Belt and The Village would still retain a countryside aspect. From the main road, to the north, the two houses Daisy Bank and Middle Meadow house, which are higher ground, are visible. These two houses are situated well into the countryside and are clearly visible from The Village as well as the north. The northern border of Site EN030 is in line with these houses. The southern and central parts of the Site are relatively flat whilst the north part rises relatively steeply. An indicative scheme for Site EN030 was submitted with the response on the Site Options Consultation in 2015. This showed the entire site excluding the house and garden being developed. If the Council considered that development on the northern part of the site would have too great an impact on the Green Belt this part of the land could be	

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							left undeveloped and tree planted to provide a backcloth to development; a definitive permanent Green Belt boundary and lessen the impact on the Green Belt. Development would only take place then on the flatter parts of the site minimising impact on the countryside. 6. It is accepted that if the site was to be developed it would extend into what is now Green Belt but it is contended that the shortage of deliverable housing land amounts to exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this land.	
PO995 PO982 PO989	Mrs H Sullivan Mr M Sullivan Mr O Sullivan				Endon	Object	In addition, the Council's plans refer to strictly controlling development outside of the development boundary. Site EN012 is outside of the development boundary. Endon is already identified as a 'larger Village' and should be protected from further development which extends beyond the current development boundary. In addition, there are other sites in the Endon and surrounding area not deemed to be Green Belt which should be developed before encroaching on the Green Belt. The approach should be to build in infill / windfall sites in brownfield areas, built in a manner which supports the current village footprint and which does not create even larger housing estates.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN012.
PO911	Mr & Mrs J. A. & C. Hamnett	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Endon	Support	STONEY LANE, ENDON – SITE EN128 My clients who are the owners of Site EN128, welcome and support the inclusion of the site in the preferred draft allocations for inclusion in the Local Plan. The site is located within the built-up area and the existing development boundary of the village and is the only site, of the three proposed, which is within the built-up area of the village and does not require removal from the Green Belt. The site is well located within the village and would be a good site for dwellings that accord with the Council's housing development policies. There are three possible accesses – from both ends of Stoney Lane which is an un-adopted road and via No. 14 Brookfield Avenue onto Brookfield Avenue. The latter property (a semi-detached house), which is owned by Mr & Mrs Hamnett, could be demolished, if required, to provide a third access. The 2015 SHLAA Site Assessment form identified that the site has excellent residential potential for up to 27 houses. The SHLAA Site Assessment form scored the site's availability as a "2" and the overall classification as a "B". This was because ownership details had not been submitted. The ownership details and the fact that the site could be immediately available for development were sent to the Council as part of the Site Options consultation in	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN128.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							2015. I can re-confirm that the site is in single ownership and is available for immediate development. The Sustainability Appraisal in the Council's "Options Assessment" considers that the proposed development of the site would have a positive effect as could the site's proximity to services and facilities. The Council commissioned Ecological Survey concluded that the site has a fairly low biodiversity value overall although there is a tree with bat roosting potential and a species rich hedgerow. At this stage the client believes that the best way to develop the site is build three distinct cells/clusters of houses each with its own separate access – one cell accessed from Brookfields Avenue; one from the western end of Stoney Lane; and the other from the eastern end of Stoney Lane. However, the final design would depend on discussions with the Council and Highways. The site was previously identified in the former Local Plan as an important visual open space. This policy no longer applies and the site is no longer designated as such. In the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessments carried out in support of the Core Strategy the recommendation is that the site is not (my underline) suitable as Visual Open Space and that the site appears to be suitable for sympathetic development. Development on the site would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape character and would not be particularly visible. The two trees protected by Tree Preservation Order which were previously on site are no longer there; one tree which was diseased was felled with permission and the other blew down. Economically the development of the site will support the existing services in the village and, if required, would help improve services and facilities. Socially, development would help ease the shortage of housing land supply in the District and village. Environmentally, development of this site lessens the pressure on the Green Belt.	
PO4494	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			Endon	Support	The revised village boundary for Endon is supported. The slightly stretched village boundary will allow for a "handful" of organic small infill housing plots to be built within the village. This will provide good opportunities for local builders and tradespeople in addition smalls sites suitable for self build schemes. [Refer to Question 1 attachments].	Support noted.
Ipstones								

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO176 PO909	Mr Howard Leeson		Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Ipstones	Object	LAND ADJACENT TO HAWES FARM, HIGH STREET, IPSTONES Object to the proposed Village Development boundary excluding the field to the north of Hawes Farm and Dairy House Farm. It is appreciated that Hawes Farm is a listed building but in at least one other village (Rushton) the proposed boundary goes up to a listed building and there is already a well established long row of twentieth century houses to the north of the field. These are of average design. The quality of development and the number of houses (one is suggested) that could be built on this land can be controlled by the council. Further, the site has good road access and any dwelling could be set well back from the road in line with houses to the north and Daisy Bank Farm to the south and it would not have an adverse impact on the listed building. Setting the house back from the road would ensure that the listed building was visible from both north and south on High Street. Inclusion of this land within the Village Development Boundary would also be in accord with Core Strategy Policy SS6a and with what I understand is a general feeling in the village that the residents would prefer small scale infill to larger developments particularly where they are not likely to add to the traffic problems in the village.	This area was previously included within the village boundary, it is adjacent to a Listed Building and within a Conservation Area. Agreed that the boundary could follow the previous village boundary and provide an opportunity for infill, however any planning applications would need to be assessed against heritage impacts.
PO259	Mr Graham Leftwich				Ipstones	General comment	The village boundary seems to have been drawn deliberately in order to select by default the preferred site for housing development and to exclude other options. It makes no sense to exclude the vicarage, the Mount, Daisy Bank Farm, the school, New House Farm, Churchfields Farm etc from the village, when they are so obviously part of Ipstones. Do you really believe that the vicar of St Leonard's does not live in Ipstones? Or that the school is outside the village? It's nonsense.	The village boundary is a planning designation and relates to policies in the development plan. It is drawn tightly around the village to prevent encroachment into the wider countryside.
PO2561	Mrs Chadwick	Ipstones Parish Council			Ipstones	Object	Consider that the village boundary should include the whole garden to No 70 High Street.	Comments noted. The site is in a sustainable location and would offer an opportunity for infill along Park Lane.
PO1295	Mr Glyn Dyer				Ipstones	Object	The draft village development boundary includes a potential infill plot along Park Lane. The Parish Council requested that the original boundary be retained. I strongly disagree with this and ask at the rear of 70 high street is included.	See response to PO1295 regarding village boundary at 70 High Street.
PO7547	Mr Glyn Dyer				Ipstones	Support	Summary of representation- see full response (attached). Ipstones Parish Council supported the inclusion of the rear garden of 70 High Street, Ipstones within the village development boundary (as shown on the site options consultation map) at the AGM on the 31st May 2016. The current boundary dissects the garden.	See response to PO1295 regarding village boundary at 70 High Street.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
Kingsley Holt								
PO666	mrs karen parkin				Kingsley	Object	Objection to draft reserve site Lockwood Rd Kingsley Holt for 50 dwellings. This site is outside the existing village boundary which were introduced to stop 'creeping' development.	Comments noted. There are no draft reserve sites included in Kingsley Holt.
Upper Tean								
PO25	Mrs Victoria Hughes				Upper Tean	General comment	Whilst relieved to see that UT041 no longer appears to be included for preferred housing allocation, the land also appears to be outside of both Checkley parish and Cheadle Ward boundaries, therefore we are still concerned and seeking reassurance as to what this means for any current or future independent planning applications such as the one currently being proposed by Mr Alcock and the architects Hewitt & Carr of Cheadle.	UT041 was included as a possible housing options site but not included as a preferred housing site in the 2016 preferred options sites and boundaries consultation. However a planning application has been submitted for residential development on the site.
PO255	mrs barbara keeling				Upper Tean	Object	I have lived in the area for the last 47 years. There has been no significant improvement in infrastructure in that time. The one site that is screaming out to be developed is the old dairy site at Fole. It has access to the main road & would take the pressure of development off Checkley, Lower Tean & Upper Tean. The drainage would enter the river lower down, lessening the fear of flooding. The council should grasp the mettle & get this site cleaned up for the benefit of the whole area. Development in Hollington has been turned down, time after time, for residents wanting to build on their homesteads. This is preventing a younger generation to live in their village. The proposed development in Hollington took no notice of the traffic flow already in the village especially JCB employees using the road as a rat run to Upper Tean & Cheadle. This will only get worse as the new traffic island works continue towards Uttoxeter & JCB open their new golf course.	Fole Dairy has planning permission for residential development and has been taken into account within the housing commitment figure for the rural area.
Werrington & Cellarhead								
PO1235	Mrs T Wiggins				Werrington & Cellarhead	Object	It is essential that as a village community that we maintain our boundaries and if these have been compromised then they should be reinstated as per council existing registers.	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1025	Mr Grant Anderson	Fradley Estates	Mr Grant Anderson		Werrington & Cellarhead	Object	PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION 4 : LARGER VILLAGES Question 33 We act for Fradley Estates, the owner of land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, Werrington ("the Site") which is put forward for housing development in this Plan. Fradley Estates objects to the village boundary for Werrington and submits that the development boundary should be amended to include the Site. Site Information Site location: Land off Tregaron Court and Langton Court, Werrington – see plan attached. Site Area (ha) About 4.45 ha (including the woodland belts to the north west boundary). Current & most recent land use Agriculture (relatively low value grazing/hay production). Description of site Greenfield Site features The south east boundary of the Site is formed by the rear boundary fences of houses in Tregaron Court, Weston Close, Ferndale Close and Langton Court. The north west boundary is a natural and defensible boundary formed by a stream course. Further east, this stream course forms part of the Green Belt boundary. The south west boundary is formed by mature woodland vegetation comprising a substantial hedgerow and hedgerow trees with associated bridleway. The bridleway lies outside the site. Again, a strong defensible boundary. The north east boundary is represented in part by the stream course referred to above but in the main by the rear of dwellings fronting Uplands Croft. The Site is well contained visually by the hedgerow and hedgerow trees to the bridleway and by a substantial belt of woodland trees near the stream course. The Site is greenfield in character but has not been put to intensive agricultural use, merely used for grazing or for a hay crop. The Site is assessed as being of relatively low ecological value. Available means of access into the Site Appropriate access to the Site is available from Tregaron Court and/or Langton Court. Land at the end of both these cul-de-sacs is retained by Fradley Estates following the construction of the adjacent housing estate and these roads were designed to accommodate future housing development beyond. The Site plan which is submitted separately by email demonstrates the extent of the freehold ownership of Fradley Estates. Short term licences have been granted to adjacent householders to temporarily use the land at both points of access so that the land remains available for access purposes for housing development. A highway report by Sanderson Associates was submitted to the Council in December 2015 which concludes that access can be provided to	Comments noted. See responses to Question 37 – Werrington housing allocations.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							serve the development of the Site which meets all current highway guidwlinwes. Availability of utilities and services All necessary utilities including potable water, foul and surface water drainage, gas, electricity, telecoms etc are available at the periphery of the Site and can be easily extended into the Site to facilitate development. Drainage connections are already available on-site. Public Right of Way/ Peripheral Planting The public right of way (outside the Site) which follows the south west boundary of the Site with hedgerows and hedgerow trees is located on the periphery of the Site and with vehicular access available elsewhere, neither the public right of way nor associated hedgerows and hedgerow trees will constrain the layout or development of the Site. Indeed, it is proposed that both features will be retained/enhanced and incorporated into the development of the Site – see the Concept Layout appended to the Bright & Associates landscape Evidence Report 2015. Constraints The Site is not at risk of flooding; there is no known land contamination; foul and surface water drainage etc is available; the Site is assessed as being of low ecological value; there is no known archaeological or heritage constraint and therefore there are no major impediments to the early development of this Site. Availability The Site and its points of access are wholly owned by Fradley Estates a development company which is of long standing and skilled in bringing forward land for housing development. Fradley Estates has been responsible for building a significant proportion of the existing housing in Werrington and is therefore very familiar with the locality and has a proven track record of delivery. Fradley Estates is willing and able to bring the Site forward for housing in the short term with a projected yield beginning within 5 years. Supporting comments Although the Site is located within the Green Belt, visually, it is well contained by the natural features that are the stream course and in particular by the well established tree belts and hedgerows on the Site periphery and outer boundary. The north east boundary of the Site is formed in part by existing housing development and in part the stream course which forms the outer boundary of the Site. A precedent has therefore been set for the use of this stream course as a defensible green belt boundary. A Landscape Evidence Report by Bright & Associates was submitted to the Council on behalf of Fradley Estates in December 2015 (“LER”). In the context of the need to	

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							find housing in a sustainable larger village such as Werrington, it is inevitable that Green Belt land will be required. THE LER concluded that in landscape and visual terms the Site is visually well contained and that in terms of the Green Belt, allocation of the Site would be less damaging to the Green Belt than many of the sites considered by the Council including the preferred options. Fradley Estates and its advisers met with Mark James and Pranali Parikh in April 2016 to discuss the Site. It was agreed at that meeting that the Site had been incorrectly classified in the SHLAA as a category C site due to the Council's misunderstanding of the access position and the incorrect assumption that access was not available. It was accepted that the Site should have been classified as category B in which case it would have been the subject of a more detailed review together with other potential sites for Werrington. It was agreed that the Site had "some catching up to do" and that Fradley Estates would submit further information in support of the Site addressing the Council's strategic Green Belt review, the Council's review of the historic landscape and the sustainability of the Site. A further report has been prepared by Bright & Associates which considers the Site and other potential sites in Werrington including the preferred options in terms of landscape and visual impact and Green Belt, which addresses any effects on the historic landscape and which assesses the sustainability of the Site. A copy of that report which also appends the earlier LER and Sanderson Associates highway report is submitted with these representations by way of separate email. It is clear from the June 2016 Bright & Associates report that:- the development of the Site will have no adverse effects on the historic landscape. the Site is more visually contained than the preferred sites for Werrington and that the allocation of the Site will improve the current sharp edge between housing and field space along the southern boundary of the Site. the Site has advantages over other sites in terms of not compromising the openness of the countryside and in visual terms it does not form part of the Green Belt. the development of the Site would meet the three dimensions of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also clear from the above, that the Site has no technical constraints which would affect its delivery - indeed as stated above, the Site is owned by a developer with a proven track record of delivery in Werrington who is keen to bring the Site forward. The	

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							same cannot be said of other potential sites in Werrington (including the preferred options). Furthermore, it is considered that rather than allocate a number of relatively small capacity sites in Werrington as in the case of the preferred options, the allocation of a relatively large site is preferable. The reasons for this include:- The Site is likely to have less impact in landscape and visual impact terms and less perceived impact on the Green Belt than sites currently under consideration. A larger site in the hands of a developer is more likely to deliver and, thereby, deliver a substantial element of the housing requirement for Werrington. A larger site such as the Site is more able to deliver affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions. On the other hand, some of the smaller sites will not be able to carry affordable housing requirements and other infrastructure contributions and so a relatively large site such as the Site is preferable in delivering overall on Development Plan objectives for sustainability. Fradley Estates also owns an area of land off Hillside Road, Werrington which could be brought forward in conjunction with the development of the Site for the delivery of open space and /or low cost housing. It is also submitted that the location and characteristics of the Site mean that a development of the Site would from a qualitative and marketing perspective be better than the Council's preferred options which locate development around the HMYO institution. Fradley Estates therefore objects to the village boundary for Werrington and submits that the development boundary should be amended to include the Site.	
PO2050	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Werrington & Cellarhead	Object	Werrington Parish Council believes that the village boundary should be coterminous with the parish council boundary. It notes that the 2015 Green Belt Review agreed to an extension of the boundary to accommodate sites favoured by SMDC and this should be allowed in respect of alternative sites recommended by the parish council.	The village boundary is a planning designation and relates to policies in the development plan. It is drawn tightly around the village to prevent encroachment into the wider countryside.
PO9520 PO9525 PO9600 PO9595 PO9598	Miss B Jack Mr N Harding Mr N Meakin Mrs A Meakin Mr J Meakin				Werrington & Cellarhead	Object	Extend the Werrington Village Boundary to be coterminous with the Werrington Parish Council Boundary. It is essential that as a village community we maintain our boundaries and if these have been compromised then they should be reinstated as per Council existing registers.	See response to PO2050 regarding village boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO9364	Mr Alan Bradshaw				Werrington & Cellarhead	Object	We would like to make the following comments regarding the “Preferred Housing Allocation” and the changes to the “Village Boundary” proposals, that if adopted would have a devastating effect on our way of life. Due to the location and elevation of the bungalow we are able to enjoy a magnificent and uninterrupted view overlooking “Park Hall” and its surrounding area, which is part of the current land deemed as “Green Belt”. When the original owners applied for planning permission and submitted plans for the bungalow the view had a major influence on the design:- Kitchen and Bathroom situated at the front of the bungalow, Bedrooms and Lounge facing the rear.(All our activities are spent at the rear of the bungalow) In 1998 outline planning permission was applied for (SMD/1998/1183) for a property to be built within the existing boundary adjacent to the bungalow. The application was refused primarily that the development would encroach onto the “Green Belt”, there were other reasons for refusal, however I do not have access to the refusal documentation. In 2003 we applied for planning permission (SMD/2003/0992) for a conservatory extension linking a large room that could only be accessed via outside steps. The application was again refused on the basis that the development would overlook the “Green Belt”, we were told by planning that we had not considered “The Eyes of the Green Belt” and that we should look at ways of accessing the room internally, (This we did in 2011). The reasons for refusal are the same now as they were in 1998 and 2003 and should be applied to any possible development. The land that has been earmarked for possible development at the rear of our bungalow would cover 80% of our boundary, no other property would be effected like ours. Our privacy at the rear of the bungalow would be totally compromised, the height and elevation of the land would make it impossible to create any screening for ourselves, or for the families and houses that we would overlook. Overnight we would go from being totally private to becoming overlooked (amended) ” for the total development. There have been several accidents and fatalities close to where access to the development would be, and despite the presence of a speed camera, I have witnessed over the last fourteen years many driving incidents outside our bungalow, the problem is compounded by having the “Wise Owl” nursery opposite with families dropping off and picking up their children. It would be an accident waiting to happen. We	Comments noted. WE070 was included as a possible housing options site but not included as a preferred housing site in the 2016 preferred options sites and boundaries consultation. The property currently lies within the Green Belt and outside the village development boundary. No change is proposed to this area as part of the new Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							currently have access to our rear garden from the farm track that leads off Ash Bank Road, this would be compromised if a road was constructed to the development, the track is narrow, and when whoever was either, entering, or exiting the garden, vehicles would not be able to pass. I have attached several photographs for your attention to support our comments. Also it appears that we are no longer within the village boundary, could you please clarify?	
Wetley Rocks								
PO2038	Mrs Pilarczyk	Cheddleton Parish Council			Wetley Rocks	Object	The comments raised before have not been taken into consideration and on this latest map the boundary has been drawn wrongly, taking out an area of land to the rear of Oaklands Close where outline approval for a development has already been granted The Council ask for the village development boundary to be extended; to incorporate the properties on both sides of Mill Lane; from the junction with the A520 Main Road – on the South side of the lane from St. John’s Church down to ‘Lodge Side’ and on the North side of the lane from the boundary of 31 Main Road down to ‘Foxdale.’ On the West side of the A520 Leek Road from ‘Silver Springs’ the Council ask for the village boundary to follow the existing line to the proposed new boundary line where it incorporates the property and land at the top of Mill Lane. The Council must ask for their comments to be taken into consideration.	The Wetley Rocks development boundary follows the edge of the Green Belt boundary. The NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the recent Housing White Paper reiterates this commitment. . The NPPF also states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. Therefore decisions on planning applications for new buildings falling outside the development boundary in the Mill Lane area will be determined on a case by case basis and have regard to national planning policy, Green Belt policy and policies in the Local Plan.
PO912	Mr winston sylvester				Wetley Rocks	Object	The development area of Wetley Rocks needs expanding as per the submission by Cheddleton Parish Council namely that the village development boundary be extended to incorporate both sides of Mill Lane to "Lodge Side" and "Foxdale". This would facilitate the possibility of infill sites that would meet the housing needs of the village for the foreseeable future. It would also correct the anomaly that the new(ish) Primary School would be included within that area !	See response to PO2038 regarding the development boundary.
PO1439	Mrs R Hartley				Wetley Rocks	Object	I am writing to you to express my concerns/views regarding your choices of site in Wetley Rocks you consider as a potentially suitable site for development. For many years Wetley Rocks was a black spot as a result of this Local MP Councillors and the inhabitants of our village, traffic calming measures were taken which dramatically reduced these accidents. You have selected site WR015, with access from Mill Lane. If this site was used for more than 3 or 4 houses, there would be considerable number of vehicles entering onto Mill Lane, close to the junction with the A520. There are	- Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WR015. - See response to PO2038 regarding the development boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							vehicles parked on mill lane from yellow lines down to below the village hall. Spaces are left for property access. On some evening and at weekends, there is often parking on the double yellow lines down to the village hall. Spaces are left for property access. The passage up to Mill Lane is very difficult on the frontage of WR015, and any development would need to be taken into careful consideration. I readily accept the need for more houses in Wetly Rocks and would suggest that the village boundary be extended to the depth of one property to include the property on both sides of Mill Lane, from junction with the A520 – on the North Side of the lane down to Lodge Side and on the south side from the 31 Main Road down the west side of Foxdale. Together with the building plans already approved Mill Lane would thus provide a source of sites that would cover our development needs for many years. Due to the apparent disregard for the views of the electorate in SM district, many people are off the opinion (see letters in the last years copies of leek Post times) that there councillors are making their views known to the officers. The electorate are heavily criticizing the councillor's I know that the councillors are passing our views on to you, but after 4 more meetings organised by my council, to explain the changes to us, there is a different plan each time and none of them seem to want to be what local people want. We then have the green belt review body totally changing things again It is not surprising that the electorate are becoming more and more disenchanted with their council.	
PO1395	Mrs K Bills				Wetley Rocks	Support	We are writing to add our approval of the development plan (preferred option site allocations and boundaries) for Wetley Rocks.	Support noted.
PO2512	Mr D Hartley				Wetley Rocks	Object	I would ask for the village development boundary to be extended to incorporate both sides of Mill Lane from the junction with the A520 - on the north side of the lane from the boundary of 31 Main Road to Foxdale. I also think the whole of the village site St Johns Church down to Lodge side of the church yard being the corner of A520 and Mill Lane should be within the village boundary as should the whole of the village school site. On the west side of the A520 from Silver Springs the council ask for the village boundary to follow the existing line to the proposed new boundary line where it incorporates the property and land at the top of Mill Lane. With houses already planned, any infill sites in Mill Lane, will satisfy and meet the needs of the settlements requirements for some time to time to	See response to PO2038 regarding the development boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	village boundary	Support/object/general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							come.	

Question 34: Do you have any comments on the infill boundaries for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
Bagnall								
PO9305	Mr David Edge	Senior Trustee Demon Pension Fund			Bagnall	Object	I would like to suggest that the infill boundary for Bagnall is extended to include the Stanley Moor settlement. This is on the basis that within the Bagnall parish only Stockton Brook and Bagnall are recognised settlements in the March 2014 Core Strategy. I believe that if the opportunity does arise in the future then the Stanley Moor settlement, which is a similar size to the Bagnall settlement, should be designated a small village in 'Core Strategy' terms and have its own Infill Boundary, which will allow a mix of dwellings rather than the possibility of them having to be all affordable / starter homes.	Bagnall is inset into the Green Belt and has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.
Checkley								
PO7384	Ms Heather Graham				Checkley	Object	I strenuously object to a change in the Development Boundary for Checkley village & the proposed inclusion of pasture land sites CK0007 & CK0008 adjacent to the A522. Any changes in boundary should come under the remit of the new Neighbourhood Plan where residents work in consultation with the council & officers. The brown field site at Fole Dairy will inevitably be developed before 2031 and the council should find ways of supporting this POSITIVE development, which will enhance the area. The surrounding villages will need to improve their facilities to support this development. The government has recognised the importance of residents becoming involved in their local area and the planning decisions in the Local Plan should listen to their views.	Checkley has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO7378	Mr Andy Graham				Checkley	Object	Checkley Village submitted a very comprehensive objection to the potential inclusion of sites CK0007 & CK0008m (2 areas of pasture land on the NORTH side of the A522) in September 2015 during the first round of consultations. Despite this these two sites remained in the proposed newly termed “infill boundary”. An increasing number of local residents have been working with residents from Tean, Lower Tean & Hollington & members of Checkley Parish Council to become involved with the implementation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan from a Government initiative to allow residents to become more involved in how their community develops. I was very disappointed, that despite this initiative and the work of many residents and the support of many more the wishes and views of residents have been ignored in the first stage of the consultation process. We are all hoping that the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the views of the residents of Staffordshire Moorlands Villages will carry some weight in the second round of consultations. CK0007 & CK0008 should be removed from the proposed development boundary and the NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN should be allowed an input into the future of Checkley Village. These sites are unsuitable for the following reasons: Fole Dairy will be developed before 2031 and will provide approx. 60 houses & Checkley & Lower Tean need to be able support this development through their infrastructure. Therefore, there is not a NEED for housing in Checkley with this site less than 1 mile away. Special landscape area designated land should not be used for residential development when other sites	See response to PO7384 regarding Checkley infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							are available. The two areas of farmland are significantly larger than is required for a proposed five dwellings. They access directly onto the A522 – on a particularly dangerous section. Development would unnecessarily impact on the landscape, environment & surrounding countryside.	
PO7368	Mr R Graham				Checkley	Object	SITES CK0007 & CK0008 I have attended several meetings. There was a huge response from residents AGAINST bringing these fields into the DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY. We were led to believe that residents views would be taken into account this is clearly NOT the case. Please listen this time. Fole Dairy is a brown field site which NEEDS developing NOT fields in a rural village on a dangerous main road, this will provide an extension to Checkley anyway! My step son was nearly knocked off his bike last week by a car pulling out of Cranberry Avenue this part of the A522 is a dangerous fast section of highway. More exits here would be endangering life. The village does not need an opportunity for 2 further building areas there are a number of small infill sites available for a few houses that do not impinge on the countryside, if required. Please develop sympathetically.	See response to PO7384 regarding Checkley infill boundary.
PO7398	Ms Heather Graham	Chair Checkley Village Awareness Committee			Checkley	Object	In September 2015 Checkley Village Awareness Committee entered into extensive consultation and involved residents in responding to the proposed boundary changes for the village. There was a huge response: from the circa. 126 residential dwellings, 81 documents were received. 79 Oppose the inclusion of CK007 & CK008 into the development boundary. 2 support. These documents were submitted en bloc and handed personally to Ruth Wooddisse at Moorlands House during the first consultation period and we ask that these documents be retained for future reference and also form part of this objection to the proposal to amend Checkley Village Development Boundary. The message was very clear: PLEASE REMOVE SITES CK0007 & CK0008 from the proposed village boundary. These sites should remain in the “special landscape area” and allow local residents to help to decide if Checkley does need more housing, where this should be & the nature of it through the “Neighbourhood Plan” initiative, currently being formulated by Checkley Parish Council. It is proposed that the Development Boundary should not be changed from 1998 and should NOT be re-classified as “infill” boundary. There are “infill” sites available within the existing boundary that could be considered for development, if deemed necessary and appropriate. At recent meetings of the residents’ association it was decided unanimously that we would not ask residents to re-submit the views they had taken time to formulate and submit in September 2015, as it was offensive. So please refer to our responses of then because NOTHING has changed in respect of these sites but there have been significant changes and advances made with Checkley Parish’s initiative to implement the Neighbourhood Plan and the resultant residents’ involvement. It is understood that Forward Planning will afford councillors & residents the opportunity to work more closely with them & when the current local plan is finally adopted it will take account of councillors & residents’ views. Therefore, changes made should be the result of working together not dictated from above and imposed upon the community at this stage. If residents are going to become involved in the new “Neighbourhood Plan” initiative & take ownership of their localities they need to see that their voice is heard and their views are taken into consideration and acted upon. This has not been demonstrated in “Round 1” of this consultation process.	See response to PO7384 regarding Checkley infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							Under the new Localism Bill it is understood that residents will have the opportunity to have more input in the future development of their village & communities, without having decisions imposed upon them. We resubmit our views as to why these two particular sites are TOTALLY inappropriate for extension to our village and would like you to take these on board and make the necessary adjustments to the boundaries on the final development plan when implemented, as you have rightly done in our neighbouring village of Lower Tean. Checkley should retain its unique, rural character. SITES CK007 & CK008 - GENERAL COMMENTS: VERY SIGNIFICANTLY : The development of the site at Fole Dairy MUST be taken into account when considering the housing allocation for Checkley, Lower Tean & Hollington. A significant residential development is planned on this 5 acre site within Checkley Parish, which will actually transform Fole into a rural village and at the same time provide significant aesthetic improvement to the area, but will also inevitably impact all three neighbouring villages. The decisions for future housing in Checkley Parish should take account of the development of this brown field site and the development of Checkley Parish Councils' Neighbourhood Plan initiative which should encourage significant community involvement in future planning decisions, otherwise it will be under mined before it is implemented. Adoption of fields, currently in the special landscape area, into potential building land should be a last resort when all other opportunities have been utilised. Why include fields when there are more suitable potential infill sites within and directly adjacent to the existing village boundary, (13 sites were considered) many are true infill sites & would be more than adequate for a total of FIVE dwellings? Any such a decision should once again be resultant from consultation within the Neighbourhood Plan framework. These 2 proposed sites are NOT infill sites in the true sense of the word they are 2 large areas of pasture, which if included would provide the opportunity for developers to build two estates opening directly onto the busy A522 which has a history of accidents and incidents. 1. SITE OPTIONS INFRASTRUCTURE – schools. There is one village school. There is a 5 acre development scheduled for Fole less than a mile away which is in the catchment of Hutchinson Memorial CE(A) School, a small village first school, where intake numbers have recently been reduced. Any future residential development potential would need to be worked through with the school and its governors and the Neighbourhood Plan. INFRASTRUCTURE – Traffic/transport New development should not take place adjacent to the A522, when other options are available. Significantly, the A522 is a fast, busy road and a notorious blackspot. The area is regularly patrolled by speed control vehicles. The proposed developments would make direct access to the road on a particularly dangerous section where there is poor visibility and there have been a number of accidents and fatalities caused by slower traffic pulling onto the race track! Many families use the footpaths along the A522 to walk to school – there is no longer a “lollypop” lady at the school and in recent times there have been a couple of incidents with vehicles and children on this footpath. More accesses would increase risk to the families who regularly use this footpath which is adjacent to the proposed developments. INFRASTRUCTURE – other In recent times there have been problems with the electricity supply to Uttoxeter Road, Cranberry Avenue &	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							Badger's Hollow – any development could not join this electrical supply system effectively. At present, there is only one small play area for younger children adjacent to Checkley Community Centre. Any significant expansion of the villages of Checkley & Lower Tean, which would be the case when development goes ahead at Fole would need to review this provision for this area as it is already inadequate. LANDSCAPE – The previous development guidance and local plans for Checkley have always been insistent that extension to village boundaries are on the South side of the A522, where the village has been developed in a controlled manner in recent years, with safer road access and confined boundaries. Previous local plans and SMDC policies have positively discouraged development on the North of the A522. There is no reason why this should be amended, as this will change the village character. NATURE CONSERVATION – The loss of pastureland will inevitably impact on the environment & surrounding countryside; this should not be considered when a brown field site is available and existing housing needs of this area can be met in this manner. SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT – The sites being considered are much bigger than the requirement for five dwellings required in Checkley. This would inevitably provide the opportunity for developers to build two larger scale housing developments. There are infill sites available for the development of five dwellings within and on the edge of the existing village boundary on the South side of the A522 where access to the main road already exists. These two sites CK0007 & CK0008 CANNOT be considered as infill boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan initiative would allow community involvement and would encourage residents to help decide how their villages should grow and evolve. The development of the FOLE DAIRY site HAS to be taken into account when considering the future need for residential development in Checkley. The development of this 5 acre site within a mile of the village, will almost certainly take place before 2031. CHECKLEY village does not need to be extended but should be able to support the development of this residential community by helping to provide adequate facilities for such a positive potential neighbouring development. 13 sites have been considered in Checkley and have been identified for potential development but this should now be carried out through the new "Neighbourhood Plan" with consideration for local need & the suitability of any proposed developments, as opposed to, a dictatorial policy from above, which will inevitably threaten the success of this new initiative. If consultation for the future is not allowed at this stage the neighbourhood plan will not work effectively up to 2031 and beyond. The government has recognised that local residents have the best local knowledge so please afford us the opportunity of working with you to make the very best decisions for everyone so that we have "ownership" of our area.	
Cresswell / Draycott								
PO200	Mrs Jacqueline Leach				Cresswell / Draycott	Object	No site boundary for Cresswell and for preferred site OC055. Cresswell is a rural hamlet NOT a small village and is not registered as a small village by SMDC therefore this goes against the NPPF and SMDC's adopted Core Strategy.	This site has outline planning approval. Committed sites will be shown on the proposals map.
PO1030	Mrs Shelagh		Mrs Shelagh		Cresswell / Draycott	Object	Cresswell and Draycott are not listed here and yet they have a major development included on the site allocations plan and 168 houses that are also NOT in the site	See response to PO200 regarding the approved site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
	Wood		Wood				allocations plan, therefore comments have been restricted by SMDC. The planning application for these two developments is under police investigation and we are awaiting a report from the Government Ombudsman regarding the passing of application SMD/2014/0576.	
Dilhorne								
PO422	Mr Howard Leeson		Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Dilhorne	Object	The boundary is drawn so tight that there is little, or no, scope for housing that meets a local need or for affordable housing. There are potential infill sites outside the proposed boundary where both local need housing could be provided but based on policy SS6b these would have to be rural exception housing which need to be underpinned financially by some market housing particularly given the uncertainty as to the future of affordable housing and the introduction of starter homes. The village is linear in nature and it would be reasonable to expand the Infill Development Boundary to include the houses on Godley Lane northwards to the 30mph sign. The boundary need not be continuous (see Cheddleton). The Infill boundary could be consist of discrete groupings with the larger green gaps outside the boundary. It could exclude the larger gaps to maintain the overall character. This would be more consistent with national policy in para. 55 of the NPPF It would also be useful if "local needs" was defined because this is often translated as just affordable housing and it should be much wider than this.	Dilhorne is washed over by Green Belt. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO126	Mr Anthony Wheat		Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Dilhorne	Object	The boundaries are drawn so tight that there is little, or no, scope for housing that meets a local need or for affordable housing within the proposed boundary. Dilhorne is a village which could accommodate more housing without damaging its essential character particularly if this housing were to be infill development in the smaller gaps that exist. The village is basically linear and there are several smaller gaps particularly on the eastern side of Godley Lane which could be infilled without damaging the character of the village. It is contended that it would be reasonable to expand the Infill Development Boundary to include the houses on Godley Lane northwards to the 30mph sign. The boundary need not be continuous; it could exclude the larger gaps to maintain the overall character and consist of consist of discrete pockets/groups of houses and potential infill sites and exclude the larger green spaces between existing development. This approach is proposed in Draycott, Longsdon, Oakamoor and Cheddleton. There are potential infill sites outside the proposed boundary where both local need housing could be provided but based on policy SS6b these would have to be rural exception housing which need to be underpinned financially by some market housing particularly given the uncertainty as to the future of affordable housing and the introduction of starter homes. The consultee has a small potential infill site where he would like to construct a house for a farm worker and a possible affordable house or starter home in a small infill gap to the south of Ash Cottage. The farm worker's dwelling would help make the affordable house viable. It would also be useful if "local needs" housing was defined as often local needs and affordable dwellings are treated as being the same thing and they are not.	See response to PO422 regarding Dilhorne infill boundary.
PO4716	Mr Michael Bamford	Planning Design			Dilhorne	Object	Agent (on behalf of landowner) reiterates representations submitted to 2015 Options consultation; namely a supporting letter proposing a wider infill boundary for Dilhorne than proposed; a 2015 Options response form (proposing this, and	See response to PO422 regarding Dilhorne infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							also a site for housing south of School Lane), a SHLAA form, and a map of this site. Refer to attachments.	
Foxt								
PO1118	Ms J Wilbraham				Foxt	Object	I am writing to object most strongly to the allocation of housing to the ancient hamlet of Foxt. I have set out my reasons below :- Additional housing in Foxt is not required and would be totally out of character in such rural setting within the Churnet Valley. The proposed developments would ruin the aesthetic appeal of this area of the Staffordshire Moorlands which is rich in heritage buildings and reduce the attraction to tourists with the consequential loss in trade to businesses reliant on tourism. The roads are insufficient to accommodate any increase in traffic and are already congested at certain times in Ipstones already. The road through Foxt is only single track. There is no requirement for the additional housing proposed. The environmental impact of any additional housing would be significant. Such developments would increase the noise and light pollution, which would be detrimental to existing wild life in the area and detract from the peace and serenity of the countryside. The proposal is incongruous with the vision for the Churnet Valley as an area of outstanding natural beauty. Instead, there is a requirement for houses in Towns and the Potteries conurbation. In parts of Stoke, Hanley and the Potteries, large areas of houses have been demolished. That is exactly the place where new houses should be built. The infrastructure is already in place and employment opportunities are available. The SMDC local plan lacks a strategic approach, instead being a scatter gun style that places houses in every hamlet and village in the area. I propose that the SMDC transfer their allocation of housing from Foxt and Ipstones to Stoke City Council where housing is seriously required and work in partnership to ensure that SMDC retains the financial incentive for housing from Government which it would otherwise receive.	Foxt does not have an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO474	Mr P Stimpson		Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	Foxt	Object	Like many of the boundaries around smaller villages that for Foxt has been drawn too tightly. Core Strategy Policy SS6b commits your Council to allowing "appropriate development which enhances community vitality or meets a local social or economic need of the settlement and its hinterland." Your Council appears now to be interpreting that policy as allowing infill development only which is incompatible with the government guidance in the NPPF that the planning system should be significantly boosting the supply of housing- guidance that your Council has so far failed to comply with. It is also incompatible with paragraph 50 of the NPPF which requires the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes. Where a boundary is drawn tightly around a settlement the opportunities for infill are limited often leaving the only option as the demolition of existing properties and their replacement. Where this has happened more dwellings are inevitably proposed on the site leading to "cramming" which is usually visually inappropriate and detrimental to the existing character of the village. The initial 2015 consultation and consideration of the responses to it gave the Council the opportunity to identify areas in the smaller villages where SS6b could be implemented positively and it is disappointing that the opportunity has been missed to be replaced by an essentially negative approach to these villages, based it would seem on the fact that in many cases the only realistic means of transport	See response to PO1118 regarding Foxt infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							is the private car. That is a fact of life and it should not be given as much weight as it appears to have been given. There are many other aspects of sustainability which are equally as important, if not more so. That is the case in Foxt which is a settlement that has not had any new dwellings built in it for over 40 years. The western infill boundary is acceptable but that on the eastern side has omitted SHLAA site FO003 which is available for development now and could be the subject of a low density development of bungalows including one-third 'affordable' dwellings which would allow existing residents in the village or its hinterland to downsize and stay in the village. The site is of no particular landscape merit and could well accommodate a modest scheme of appropriate housing as an infill scheme. The vision for the District speaks of sustainable and balanced rural communities and that requires villages like Foxt to have more growth than is currently planned. The eastern boundary should be extended to accommodate limited infilling on currently undeveloped land as suggested.	
PO563	Mr Peter Cowie				Foxt	Object	In my experience infill prohibits open views which in turn leads to an urban sense of being closed in. This is counter productive to the health and well being of residents and leads to the development of urban sprawl where villages join with each other and become a conurbation with a gross lack of identity.	See response to PO1118 regarding Foxt infill boundary.
PO564	Mr Peter Cowie				Foxt	Object	Foxt was formerly open country. Residents live here because they like open country and there is no good reason to change its status.	Comments noted.
PO4465	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Foxt	Support	Letter submitted by agent on behalf of landowner that supports inclusion of their premises [Central Garage Foxt Road] within Preferred Option infill boundary. [Refer to attached letter].	See response to PO1118 regarding Foxt infill boundary.
PO4466	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Foxt	Object	Letter submitted from agent on behalf of owner of Central Garage premises, Foxt Road, which objects to exclusion of SHLAA site FO008 from Preferred Options infill boundary of village. This also clarifies that access is available through Central Garage premises to the site as they are both in same ownership. [Refer to letter attached to comment PO4465].	See response to PO1118 regarding Foxt infill boundary.
Hollington								
PO429	Mr David John Allen				Hollington	Object	The infill shown now appears to be limited to the area immediately surrounding the Church. I do not see any possibility in building within this tight area as a good proportion appears to be the grave yard. The infill should be extended to cover from one end of Hollington to the other, allowing development on spaces between existing properties and the development on existing homesteads. I do how ever feel to go with this the speed limit through the whole village should be reduced to 30 MPH when considering the volume of JCB commuting traffic between Cheadle and Rocester.	Hollington does not have an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO581	Mrs Sandra Peck				Hollington	General comment	The infill area would not be able to accommodate new homes. This area is no longer regarded as the centre of the village by locals. This area does not enable any brown field sites to be taken into account.	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.
PO597	DR William Callender				Hollington	Object	This boundary is unsuitable because it covers an area where there is no suitable space to build and concentrates development around an area where the roads are particularly narrow and hazardous due to restricted visibility whilst being subject to large traffic flows, particularly from commuting workers to the JCB factory in Rocester. Furthermore, Hollington is a linear village and the infill area is at one	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							end, it should be more to the centre, around the village hall, located at the junction between Quarry Bank and Holington Road.	
PO684	mr ivor moseley				Hollington	Object	The infill site is exceedingly small and includes the church and graveyard. The area selected doesn't have the space to put more than 1 house as far as I can see - unless there is extensive earth removal on the Hollington to Denstone Rd. It would have been much better to have had a more sympathetic attitude to local residents previous planning applications which are seemingly routinely turned down.	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.
PO7417	Mr Derek Wragg				Hollington	General comment	Housing Issues - Many applications for infill housing have been refused in the past in favor of tourism or holiday accommodation some of which have not been fully utilised for this purpose or not used at all. Solutions - Extend the village development boundary or rezone to release land for affordable homes for the younger generation. Preferred Sites and Infill Boundaries Hollington is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully: uncharacteristic infilling could ruin the fabric of the village while estate development would overwhelm it. The protection of the villages visual, historic and landscape qualities is also a key factor in keeping the status of a working village and rural environment, the village having 3 fully operational stone quarries which are major contributors to the County of Staffordshire's mineral wealth. My personnel opinion is that the Infill / Development Boundary should be revised or expanded into zones taking into consideration two major requirements. One to enable the residents to build on homesteads to meet their personnel accommodation needs be it for younger or older relative. A thing that has been denied in the past in favour of holiday accommodations. The village could also benefit in the sustainability of its assets be it for proposed environmental recreational or retail use by its residents in the long term by implementing this strategy'. Secondly it would not conflict with the integrity of the Minerals Planning Strategy and any future Procurement of natural stone reserves or inherent minerals for future generations And the possibility of releasing sterilized land for future development or other use in keeping with the criteria of the existing Green Belt status of the village. A minerals extraction or boundary plan should also be considered for publication with the Local Plan.	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.
PO7437		Hollington Residents' Steering Group			Hollington	Object	Housing The problem for the 2015 housing site allocation exercise is that the current combination of the amber status of the two sites identified in the village and the highly restrictive village development boundary means that there is little chance of any house building in Hollington in the near future. There is a demand for affordable housing that should combat the further decline in village amenities. Furthermore the strong objections to the two sites near the Cross regarding the size of these plots and the traffic problems that new housing on this very narrow section of road indicate to many in the village that these sites are unsuitable for housing development. The housing market is further distorted by the amalgamation of small terraced quarrymen's cottages into larger housing units which in many cases like other housing units, are often under occupied by elderly couples or individuals. There are very few opportunities for downsizing in the village because planning permission for such developments on homesteads like starter homes has usually been refused. On the other hand, applications to build new holiday cottages, some of which are out of character with the stone built	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							housing stock in the village have been much more successful. Extending the development boundary and giving more balanced consideration to new units aimed at downsizing or affordable starter homes would permit stronger geographical family links. Another strategy would be to identify brown field or designated quarrying land more central to the overall structure of the village e.g. at or near the junction between Main Road and Quarry Bank, for housing with stronger affordability and downsizing opportunities. Employment Hollington is a working village with jobs in agriculture, quarrying and increasingly recreation and tourism. The main problem is that young people who were born in the village cannot afford to buy properties in the village. An affordable housing development and/or a relaxation of planning restrictions on building on homesteads (see Housing) would make the village a more vibrant community with a lower age profile. Retailing The village has lost 2 shops, a mobile library and a post office in the last thirty years. A recent application to open a shop in the village was refused. The Hollington Residents' Steering Group are interested in creating an opportunity to develop markets for the sale of local produce in the village hall but a limitation to this development is the limited public car parking space near the hall. It would also be appropriate to revisit the application to SMDC for permission to open a shop in the village. Infrastructure Traffic is the major issue here. The ridiculous situation we have now is that three speed limits meet at the Quarry Bank- Main Road junction. Going east is a 30 mph, going west is 40 mph and going north it is national speed limit. Ironically the roads get narrower going north and west and there are no pavements in the village. There should be a rationalisation of the limit to 30 mph supported by traffic calming measures to combat speeding along Main Road. A speed watch survey recently identified a traffic flow of 166 cars in an hour of which around 17% were exceeding the 30 mph limit. The narrowness of the roads in the village combined with blind junctions on Main Road at Quarry Bank, the Cross, Ground Hollow and Firbob Lane are all accident spots. Appropriate measures such as mini roundabouts should be put in place to reduce car speeds and the associated accident risk. The planning process needs to be looked at as part of the social infrastructure. Residents of the village feel that they are caught in a catch 22 situation where residential facilities are approved for tourism but not for long term occupation.	
PO7546		Hollington Residents' Steering Group			Hollington	Object	The proposed development boundary provides little or no capacity for development, encompassing gardens and a churchyard. There are numerous smaller sites elsewhere within the village boundary that would better assimilate new housing, without impairing the character of the village.	See response to PO429 regarding Hollington infill boundary.
Hulme								
PO4461	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Hulme	Support	Submits report on behalf of landowner that supports the inclusion of site HU002 within the settlement infill boundary for the village. However states that, having regard to the conclusions of the Local Authority's Green Belt Review, also considers that there is merit in extending the proposed infill boundary to include another parcel of land in client's ownership to immediate east. [Refer to attached Report].	Hulme does not have an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
								policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
Leekbrook								
PO3925 PO3922	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			Leekbrook	Object	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client 's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which also covers this question].	Leekbrook has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
Longsdon								
PO217	Mr & Mrs Anthony & Gillian Laverick	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Longsdon	Object	RIDGEWAY HOUSE, LEEK ROAD, LONGSDON, ST9 9QF On behalf of my clients I write in support of the inclusion of their property in the proposed Village Infill Development Boundary. Ridgeway House and garden is part of the group of properties along Leek Road and is located close to the village church and village hall and as such the proposal to include the property in the Infill Development Boundary is supported. However, I object, on my clients' behalf to the fact that the proposed Infill Boundary line arbitrarily crosses their garden at a point roughly halfway across it. The proposed line does not follow any physical feature and excludes the northern part of the garden from the proposed Infill Boundary area. The proposed boundary in the neighbouring house to the east – Holly Grange – also arbitrarily crosses the garden there at roughly the halfway point. Next door to the west the proposed boundary line at The Old Smithy follows the stream which forms the northern boundary of the property. The same stream also forms the north-eastern boundary of the gardens at both Ridgeway House and Holly Grange. Yet at Ridgeway House and Holly Grange an arbitrary boundary is proposed which does not follow any physical feature. The reasons for objecting to the proposed Infill Development Boundary line are: 1. The line appears to be purely arbitrary. It is generally accepted that it is good planning practice for planning boundaries to follow physical features on the ground. Advice in paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to Green Belt boundaries is that physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent should be used. The same essential approach should apply to the proposed Infill Development Boundary particularly as the village is in the Green Belt. The stream that forms the northern garden boundary is a readily recognisable and permanent feature and it is contended that the Infill Boundary line should follow this feature which is also the garden boundary at Ridgeway House and Holly Grange. 2. The position of the infill boundary line at Ridgeway House would in effect prevent the land being used for infill development given that there are mature trees, which are worthy of retention, around the garden edges and it would be extremely difficult to construct a house with parking and turning space and an adequate garden within the space available. If the Infill Boundary were to be amended to follow the stream to the north-east then there would be sufficient space in the eastern part of the garden to enable a house and facilities to be built there without causing any	Longsdon is washed over by Green Belt. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							harm to the trees or the character of the area and to provide access with good visibility sight-lines. 3. The proposed line of the Infill Boundary across the garden seems to negate the purpose of the Infill Development Boundary which is to define/indicate where appropriate development will be allowed and not, instead, prevent development. General comment Longsdon village in reality consists of clusters of houses along Leek Road, Sutherland Road, Denford Road and Micklea Lane. It is contended that the clusters of houses along Micklea Lane and Denford Road should be included in the Infill Boundary.	
PO561	Mrs Margaret May				Longsdon	Object	The SMDC policy that has been applied to smaller villages development is to put infill boundaries around the spine of the village. Longsdon does not have a spine as such as it has low density housing spread over several roads - ribbon development. Sutherland Road has no more houses per metre than Micklea Lane or Denford Road for example and it is unclear why it has been identified as the spine. Longsdon is the village that proves the exception to this rule with regard to this policy. In order not to spoil its character the infill boundary needs to be extended to cover several roads in the village and rules put in place that ensure that the building requirement for Longsdon which we believe should be nearer 12 than 20 is spread evenly throughout the village. Existing planning permissions already account for about 5 of those required. Many householders have large gardens already designated as residential land and sites have already been put forward for consideration in Denford Road and Micklea Lane, including our own half acre, which makes up half our garden. We believe this is also the view of the Longsdon Parish Council. We also have concerns about further development along the A53 as that appears to be in direct contravention of the recommendations in the Green Belt Review (2015), which states, "Part of the central core of the Green Belt in this locality, which strategically ensures that there is a proper separation between the Stoke conurbation and Leek and that the accessible countryside in this location is protected from encroachment, particularly along key transport corridors such as the A53." In the circumstances, we think this should be excluded from the infill boundary.	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.
PO758	Mr Paul Webb	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Longsdon	Object	SITES LO007 AND LO021 - LAND TO THE SOUTH-WEST AND EAST OF WHITEHAVEN, LEEK ROAD, LONGSDON, STOKE-ON-TRENT, ST9 9QF. On behalf of my client I write objecting to the proposed Infill Development Boundary in so far as it affects the Site LO007 and, to the omission of potential development sites LO007 and LO021 from the proposed allocated sites and their omission from the proposed Infill Development Boundary. Mr Webb is representing the owners of the site, Anne Webb, David Sigley Ferns and Miles Sigley-Brown. In more detail my client's objections and reasons for those objections are: 1. The proposed Infill Development Boundary line I object, on my client's behalf, to the fact that the proposed Infill Development Boundary line arbitrarily crosses the Site LO007 and does not follow any physical feature excluding the southern part of the land from the proposed Infill Boundary area. The proposed boundary follows the rear boundary of the houses to the west, on the same side of Leek Road, until it gets to the house (Wynn Dene) next to my client's site where it cuts across the corner of the rear garden of Wynn Dene and then continues, not following any recognisable physical feature, in a diagonal arbitrary line to the east where it meets the rear	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							boundary of Whitehaven. From there it continues eastwards along the rear boundary of Whitehaven, the next door house to the east and the Village Hall. Elsewhere in the proposed Infill Boundary the boundary line follows physical features including site and garden boundaries. The reasons for objecting to the proposed Infill Development Boundary line are: The line appears to be purely arbitrary. It is general good planning practice for planning boundaries to follow physical features on the ground. Advice in paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to Green Belt boundaries is that physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent should be used. The same essential approach should apply to the proposed Infill Development Boundary as much as the actual Green Belt boundary because the village is in the Green Belt where it is important that boundaries are recognisable and permanent. The southern boundary of the site is in line with the rear garden boundaries of the three houses to the immediate west. It is reasonable and logical for the proposed Infill Development boundary to follow the southern boundary of the site because the hedge and trees along this boundary are recognisable and permanent physical features which continue the line of the gardens to the west. Moving the proposed boundary to the southern site boundary would be consistent with the plot size of the houses to the west; allow adequate garden, parking and turning space; and allow a development in keeping with the character of the adjoining houses. The proposed Infill Boundary across the site creates an irregular shaped site which would be more difficult to develop. The position of the infill boundary line at Site LO007 would restrict the amount of infill development that could be built on the land or may prevent any infill development at all. It is recognised that access from Leek Road to this site is difficult and that an outline planning application (SMD/2015/0634) for two houses on the site has been refused in 2016. One of the three reasons for refusal was that it was not considered possible to construct an access on the site with adequate visibility splays on land under the applicant's control. Following this refusal discussions have been held with the owner of the adjoining property, Wynn Dene, and it seems possible, and likely, that an agreement could be reached whereby access to the site could be provided from Wynn Dene westernmost access (it has two). This would enable infill development on the site. Even if this access could not be provided it would be possible to access the site from the south as part of a development of Site LO021. This is explored in more detail below in the objection to the omission of the two sites from the preferred allocated residential development sites. The proposed line of the Infill Boundary across the site seems to negate the purpose of the Infill Development Boundary which is to define/indicate where appropriate development will be allowed, and not instead, prevent or restrict development. 2. The omission of Sites LO007 and LO021 from the preferred allocated sites These two sites adjoin Site LO002 on Sutherland Road and all three sites were put forward in the Site Options Consultation in 2015 as possible development sites. The three sites adjoin each other and are situated close to the junction of Sutherland Road and the A53 (Leek Road). These sites are assessed in the supporting documents to this present consultation including the Green Belt Review. Sites LO007 and LO021 belong to Anne Webb, David Sigley-Brown and Miles Sigley-Brown who are represented by	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							Mr Paul Webb of 22 Admiralty Way, Eastbourne, BN23 5PP . Site Lo002 is in different ownership. All three sites are in the Green Belt and were included in the draft Infill Boundary for the village. I am not acting for the owner of Site LO002 and the site is only mentioned because the three sites were assessed together in the Green Belt Review and form a contiguous potential development area. Access to Sites LO007 and LO021 can be best provided through Site LO021. In the proposed Sites and Boundaries documents Site LO007 and Site LO021 are not shown as proposed residential sites. Site LO002 (fronting onto Sutherland Road) is not shown as a proposed draft allocation but the site is included in the proposed Infill Development Boundary. Only part of Site LO007 and none of Site LO021 are included in the proposed Infill Boundary. In practice, if the proposed Infill Boundary remains the same Site LO002 could be developed for Infill Housing leaving Sites LO007 and LO021 potentially landlocked and undevelopable. Yet in the Site Options Assessment, the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt Review the site is assessed as generally favourable and suitable for development. If Sites LO002 and Sites LO021 were released for development vehicular access could be provided to the rear of Site LO007 releasing the whole of the site for development. Mr Webb on behalf of the site owners objects to the omission of these sites from the proposed site allocations and requests that both sites are included for residential development in the Local Plan and that both sites are included within the proposed Infill Development Boundary for the following reasons: In the Green Belt Review all three sites were appraised as one and the recommendation was that the three sites be considered for release whilst Longsdon should remain washed over to contribute to wider strategic purposes of preventing sprawl along the A53. The Review considered that release of the three sites would have a very limited overall impact on Green Belt purposes. In terms of the Green Belt the development of the sites would not reduce the gap between Stoke and Leek or gaps between the village and Leek and Endon. The Sustainability Appraisal considered that the development of the two sites for dwellings (LO007 and LO021) would have a positive effect as would the sites' accessibility to areas of open space. It is contended that the stated negative effects mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisals do not give a true picture. The negative effects (shown in italics) mentioned in the Appraisal are: o The sites are inaccessible to services and facilities and employment areas Whilst there are relatively few services in the village the sites are close to the A53 (Leek Road) which is the main route between Leek and Stoke and Hanley and along which there is a regular bus service between Hanley/Stoke and Leek all of which contain ample services and employment opportunities. The nearest shop is on Ladderedge less than a kilometre away and there are shops, doctors, schools and other services in Endon which is about 4 kilometres (2.5 miles) to the east on the A53. Leek centre is about 3-3.5 kilometres (1.9-2.2 miles) away. The two sites are situated close to the Village Hall, the church and a pub; closer than many other parts of Longsdon. o Involves the development of greenfield land This is correct but the sites are not in active use for agriculture and are isolated from farms. On balance it is contended that the benefits of housing on the sites would outweigh the loss of this land. o The site's proximity to designated historic assets. No details are given in the Appraisal but	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							the sites are not in or near a Conservation Area nor are there any listed buildings on or near the site. The two sites do not flood (source: Environment Agency Map on the Web). The sites could be accessed from Sutherland Road through site LO002. If the Council were to allocate the three sites for development it could stipulate that the development the three sites must be developed in effect as one site with shared access. Site LO021 is identified in the Options Site Assessment as a draft Reserve Site which indicates that the Council consider that it probably could be developed with access from Sutherland Road. Site LO007 is shown on the Site Options Appraisal map as constrained. This is probably because of the issue of access. There is potential that the site could be accessed through sites LO021 and LO002 which would make development possible. Also, there is strong possibility that Site LO007 can be accessed through the western entrance to Whitehaven. It is appreciated that there is strong local opposition, including from the Parish Council, to the development of these two sites (and also LO002) and that there is a public preference for extending the Infill Boundary to include other parts of Longsdon and providing for housing need through infill development. There is also a history of planning refusals for single houses on Site LO002. However, it is contended that development on the two sites together with Site LO002 would create a compact development which would have little adverse impact on the Green Belt or village character. It is considered that the benefits of development on the site would significantly outweigh the disbenefits. The Council in its comments in the Options Site Assessment stated that development on both sites would not be out of proportion with rest of the village. The Council in its comments in the Options Site Assessment stated that it is not possible to meet the requirements of the village upon brownfield sites alone. Whether possible infilling within the proposed Infill Development Boundary can meet this need is not indicated. General Comment It is contended that the Council's approach allocating particularly proportions of development to the towns and rural areas is too regimented and arbitrary and that allocations or requirements for specific areas rather being allocated on a percentage or formula basis should be based on the capacity of a town or village to absorb or provide for development without material harm. It is possible that Longsdon could accommodate more that the target of twenty houses particularly if the Infill Development boundaries were extended without any environmental harm. This could mean that some proposed sites in the District which cause environmental harm could either be reduced in size or omitted altogether. Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Framework states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is such a case.	
PO1156	Mr L Leigh				Longsdon	General comment	I have recvd the draft plan for the future housing in Longsdon. Could you please explain to me why my also me also my neighbours land Highview and Woodview have not been included in the infill boundary. This does not seem to make sense as they are only small parcels of land in Sutherland road. Those are available. If you was too walk down Sutherland Road from the top down there is only 3 field entrances on the right not infills. No infills in limes Ave and a small paddock keeps horses , near the bottom of Sutherland road. I know there is going to be public meetings where the public can have their say, but the last public consultations	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							comments were not taken into account, I have also spoke to an officer many times could you supply me with the governments dept. address where final say is. Could you please answer my letter, and not just a postcard thanking me for my comments?	
PO3909	Mr G Messenger				Longsdon	Object	I support the principle of infill development boundaries to ensure there is delivery of windfall housing in the heart of small villages. However, larger individual sites need to be identified by the local authority to ensure that the housing target is delivered and the policy approach is 'effective'. The absence of identified development sites in small villages is not 'justified' or the most appropriate strategy. I request that larger development sites such as LO002 continue to be identified for development in the Local Plan. [Letter attached].	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.
PO3908	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Longsdon	Object	I object to my client's land (and the parcel of land beyond to the north), not being included within said residential infill boundary. [Two attachments].	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.
PO9703	Mr David Edge	Senior Trustee Demon Pension Fund			Longsdon	Object	Email and map [attached] submitted: I would like to suggest that the infill boundary for Longsdon is extended from Henshaw Brow towards St. Chad's Church as far as the planners deem appropriate. Similarly along School Lane from Henshaw Brow and Highfield House, which are both at the junction of School Lane and the A53. See attached amendment to a snapshot of the Longsdon Draft Infill Boundary. With regard to the land adjoining the A53 between its junction with School Lane and St. Chad's Church, the access onto the A53 along most, if not all, of this boundary is very good and conforms to all the highways requirements for a 40mph zone, which cannot be said of most of the land on the opposite side of the A53. There is also the possibility of providing a single access point onto the A53 by the use of a service road behind the existing hedge and trees so as to diminish any visual impact that may be caused by this development. The strategy of a service road behind the existing hedge and trees could also be used if the infill boundary was extended further along School Lane from its junction with the A53.	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.
PO9699	Mr David Edge	Senior Trustee Demon Pension Fund	Mr Rob Ford		Longsdon	Object	Representation submits earlier 2015 representations/correspondence from Rob Ford promoting a number of sites for residential development; and a boundary adjustment to the proposed infill boundary, for Longsdon: On behalf of Mr and Mrs Edge, I have earlier submitted a site suggestion (for housing) at Longsdon. The site being to the west of School Lane at it's junction with the main road. Having regard to the ongoing consultation process and the comments made by the Longsdon Parish Council in respect of site allocations thus far, I have produced a sketch drawings showing 8 no. possible houses for part of the above site. This shows 4 affordable dwellings and 4 open market , 2 of which are shown as single storey. This is intended to be helpful in the ongoing process of selection. We have chosen to show development at this end of the larger site proposed because it is particularly less prominent than other sites in the area and development is thereby less intrusive within the Green Belt.	See response to PO217 regarding Longsdon infill boundary.
Lower Tean								
PO332	Mr Richard Brittleban	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainma	Ken Wainman Associates	Lower Tean	Object	SITE LT009 LOWER TEAN – LAND EAST OF TEANHURST ROAD . On behalf of my client I object to the omission of site LT009 from the proposed residential allocations. The reasons for objecting to the exclusion of the site are: · The	Lower Tean has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
	k		n	Ltd			Council's SHLAA assessment form for site LT009 states that development here would adversely affect the settlement pattern and lead to undesirable encroachment into the countryside. This is disputable – it would add to the settlement certainly but it is contended that it is not correct that the proposed development would harm the settlement pattern or the countryside. It would consolidate development in the village. It would be in keeping with the basic settlement pattern of the village which is a rough acorn shape rather than linear development. Also, the site is adjacent to modern housing and development and would not be out of character with this part of the village. · The whole site can be developed whereas the Council's SHLAA assessment of the other potential sites that were assessed in the consultation process is that they should only contain frontage development. · LT009 contains mature trees which with careful design to retain the trees would create an attractive development. · The proposed Infill Development Boundary for the Lower Tean is tightly drawn and leaves very few, if any, sites where infill could take place and effectively means that no new housing for local needs or affordable housing could be provided in the village. · Site LT009 is large enough to require affordable housing under current national planning guidance and this may be the only way. The village is in Checkley Parish and a housing needs survey was published in 2012. The survey report did not recommend a specific number of affordable houses or local need houses that need to be provided in the Parish. However, it did identify 13 potential returnees plus the survey identified 29 responders in housing need and in favour of an affordable housing scheme. It is accepted that there are some potential infill sites in Checkley but no specific site that might accommodate the possible need has, as far as I am aware, been identified in the Parish. Outline permission for up to 60 houses was granted in June 2014 but there does not appear to be any affordable housing in the scheme. · The site has good access and does not have the issues that the other sites in the village which were appraised as part of the site assessment process. My client asks that Site LT009 be put forward as a preferred site for Lower Tean.	map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO473		Staffordshire Rural Development Ltd	Mr John Wren	JMW Planning Limited	Lower Tean	Object	Like many of the boundaries around smaller villages that for Lower Tean has been drawn too tightly. Core Strategy Policy SS6b commits your Council to allowing "appropriate development which enhances community vitality or meets a local social or economic need of the settlement and its hinterland." Your Council appears now to be interpreting that policy as allowing infill development only which is incompatible with the government guidance in the NPPF that the planning system should be significantly boosting the supply of housing- guidance that your Council has so far failed to comply with. It is also incompatible with paragraph 50 of the NPPF which requires the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes. Where a boundary is drawn tightly around a settlement the opportunities for infill are limited often leaving the only option as the demolition of existing properties and their replacement. Where this has happened more dwellings are inevitably proposed on the site leading to "cramming" which is usually visually inappropriate and detrimental to the existing character of the village. The initial 2015 consultation and consideration of the responses to it gave the Council the opportunity to identify areas in the smaller villages where SS6b could be	See response to PO332 regarding Lower Tean infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							implemented positively and it is disappointing that the opportunity has been missed to be replaced by an essentially negative approach to these villages, based it would seem on the fact that in many cases the only realistic means of transport is the private car. That is a fact of life and it should not be given as much weight as it appears to have been given. There are many other aspects of sustainability which are equally as important, if not more so. Your approach to Lower Tean is inconsistent based I suspect on the locally organised opposition to the outline planning application submitted for site LT001 rather than any consideration of the facts. Less than a year ago your Council said there was a need for over twenty new dwellings in this settlement and that they could not be provided within the existing development boundary. Appeal decisions have confirmed that the original development boundary is out of date and the need for new housing which you identified has not gone away yet you have drawn a boundary which offers no reasonable prospects of infilling to provide the housing you have said is needed. Site LT001 offers the opportunity for development now. There are no technical reasons why it cannot be developed as confirmed by the responses to the planning application. What is needed is a layout that keeps the development away from the northern boundary and concentrates development on the Uttoxeter Road frontage where it will be seen as filling an existing gap between dwellings. Approximately nine dwellings could be accommodated on this basis including three affordable dwellings or starter homes. The development boundary should be repositioned to allow this to happen.	
Rudyard								
PO195	Mr David Cross				Rudyard	Object	Extending the infill boundary of Rudyard would be detrimental to the village having a negative affect on the villages tourist appeal, and contrary to the villages unique historical nature, prompting SMDC to consult on conservation area status for the village.	Rudyard is washed over by Green Belt. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO1479	H & M Beswick				Rudyard	Object	This site is now included in the proposed village boundary, it is near to the highway which is served by public transport. Several houses can be built on this site which would keep traffic out of the busy lake road	See response to PO195 regarding Rudyard infill boundary.
PO1469	Mr H Wilson				Rudyard	General comment	Appeal at the end of The Drive Lake Road Rudyard I am surprised that you had not included the land at the end of the Drive Lake Road, Rudyard in your infill area proposed. The land is the most suitable to be included in the infill areas being the following: More than the require dwellings approx 6 could be built on the land the land has all the utilities nearby the land is not overlooked only from the rears of 4 dwellings the previous assessment was very suitable to include infill areas. The shortage of housing requires more dwellings to be built in the area. Grouping village areas is not acceptable and does not reflect each village needs and	See response to PO195 regarding Rudyard infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							assumption are not accurate. The assumption made by the council not to include more land in the proposed infill areas and the amount of housing that is required over the next few years is not acceptable and most of the area allowed in the proposed infill area is not suitable for building. Two areas have been enlarged without colouring the areas pink. There has been no consideration given to the amount of dwellings that will be required in the next few years. It seems the decisions have been made NOT to enlarge the infill areas and to be as they are now, and not to follow the wishes of the government to increase building areas. You had requested representation's with the proposed sites in which at least a number of dwellings could be built and as far as the land is mentioned above you designated it. To be a suitable site in your assessment. What has changed? You do not seem to have included any additional sites for the building. I would therefore ask you to include the land in your infill area.	
PO3900	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Rudyard	Support	Supports client's site (RU020) being incorporated into draft infill boundary; and site RU016 being excluded. [1 attachment submitted].	See response to PO195 regarding Rudyard infill boundary.
PO3896	Mr Roger Yarwood	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd			Rudyard	Object	[Letter attached to email]: I wish to comment as follows on the above Plan. I represent the owners of the Hotel Rudyard. The way in which some settlements have been "washed over" with a Green Belt designation, and some have been excluded from, but surrounded by, the Green Belt is inconsistent and illogical. A consistent approach should be adopted. This should be achieved by excluding land within the "infill boundaries" from the Green Belt. The definition of infill boundaries has been undertaken inconsistently. In general they are too tightly drawn to the extent that the Council will not achieve its housing target which relies on 10% windfall provision. In particular, it is totally illogical to leave the Hotel Rudyard outside the infill boundary. The Hotel Rudyard is clearly a part of the core of the settlement and leaving it outside the infill boundary will stifle any future development plans needed to increase its tourism potential and its viability. The hotel and its grounds should be within the infill boundary and, preferably, Green Belt should not wash over the area within the infill boundary.	See response to PO195 regarding Rudyard infill boundary.
Rushton Spencer								
PO213	Mr Richard Bailey		Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Rushton Spencer	Support	STATION ROAD, RUSHTON On behalf of my client Mr. Richard Bailey. I welcome the proposal to extend the development boundary along Station Lane down to the Knott Inn. Mr. Bailey owns the site on Station Road to the immediate east of the Knott Inn. On the west side of the site is a small brook and the Environment Agency flood risk map does not identify the site as being at risk from flooding. The site has the advantage that it is sandwiched between existing developed sites – Cherry Brook to the east and the Knott Inn to the west. There are existing services along Station Lane and development on the site would be a continuation of the existing modern development along Station Lane. As part of the Site Options consultation in 2015 Mr. Bailey submitted a plan showing the land which he wished to see included in the proposed infill development boundary. The proposed Infill Development Boundary runs along the southern side of the agricultural building on the land and roughly in line with the southern boundary of the Knott Inn car park. Now Mr. Bailey has seen the proposed boundary and the proposals	Rushton Spencer is located on the edge of the Green Belt and has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							for the village he asks that consideration be given to moving the southern infill boundary south to a point in line with the southern edge of the Knott Inn car park and the rear boundary of the two houses, Cherry Brook and the Willows, to the north-east along Station Road. A location plan showing the suggested revised Infill Development Boundary is..[attached]. The purple line on the location plan shows the current proposed boundary and the red line shows the suggested amended boundary. With regard to site RS009 on the Macclesfield road my client, Mr Bailey has a lifelong agricultural tenancy on this land and therefore objects to this land to the land being developed as it would have a significant effect on his business and livelihood.	
PO816	Mrs K Foschtinski				Rushton Spencer	Object	RS005 which is the only infill without a red light, has already been turned down by the Inspector when the owners applied to have the land turned into a garden area. The Inspector dismissed the appeal as the site was very visible throughout Rushton and was the gateway to the village. There should be no encroachment on either greenfield or greenbelt sites, houses should be dispersed around the village on brownfield sites.	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.
PO571	Mrs & Miss B & L D Brown	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Rushton Spencer	Object	Land to the north of Tea Cottage, Macclesfield Road, Rushton Spencer, SK11 0QU On behalf of my client Mrs B Brown of Wuthering Heights, Heaton, Rushton Spencer, and Miss L D Brown of 3, St Luke's Court, Leek I object to the omission of an area of land north of the track on the north of Tea Cottage from the proposed Infill Village Development Boundary and the continued inclusion of this land in the Green Belt. The track north of Tea Cottage leads to Lime Tree Cottage, Mole Hill and The Limes. In January 2012 I wrote a letter on behalf of Mr F B Brown (now passed), the husband of Mrs Brown, seeking the inclusion of the land in the housing land availability assessment. This did not happen probably because the site was too small as it can only accommodate one house and was therefore below the threshold for inclusion in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Mrs Brown would now ask that the site is omitted from the Green Belt and included in the proposed Village Infill Boundary for the following reasons: The site is the former garden belonging to Tea Cottage which lies immediately south of the track/drive. The land is now overgrown but there are still several signs on the site, including two sheds, that the site was used as a garden. When Tea Cottage was sold to another person in October 2001 by Mr F B Brown and Miss L D Brown only the house was sold and not the garden which remained in Mr Brown and Miss Brown's ownership. Whilst there are three mature trees on the site which are protected by Tree Preservation Order I met with the Council's tree officer on site in 2012 and it was agreed that it would be possible to site a house on the site without harming the protected trees. The Tree Preservation Orders on the site are addressed "Tree Cottage, Macclesfield Road, Rushton" which confirms the link between the cottage and the site. The previous village development boundary for Rushton Spencer in the now defunct Local Plan (1998) was much more tightly drawn than the proposed boundary focussed on the southern part of the village including Sugar Lane. The northern part of the village was not in the village development boundary and was washed over by the Green Belt. The present proposed boundary now includes all the intervening houses that were there in 1998 and several newer houses on Station Lane (which is just to the south) and	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							these newer houses include the three houses down the track/drive which borders the south side of the site which Mrs Brown would like to see released from the Green Belt. It is contended that this it is unreasonable and not to exclude what is residential land, albeit it is garden, from being in the Village Infill Boundary particularly as the site boundaries are clear and permanent. To the south is the track and Tea Cottage; to the north there is a mature hedge and a pond and willow carr; to the west is the Limes and a stream and field boundary and to the east is Macclesfield Road. The pond and the willow carr would be difficult to develop because of the problems of drainage, because of its landscape value and its likely ecological value. The willow carr and the mature hedge and trees on the site and the nearby buildings create a “contained” development of which with good design would not harm the openness of the Green Belt and not conflict with the purposed of the Green Belt. It is possible that there might be newts including great crested newts, which are protected in the pond, but it is considered that suitable and effective mitigation measures could be provided if required. That would allow a house to be built on the site. The site is part of the group of three houses - Lime Tree Cottage, Mole Hill and The Limes – served off track and residential development for one house, possibly a bungalow, would be in context. The recent High Court judgement (Dartford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) concluded that the definition of “previously developed land” (brownfield land) only excludes residential gardens if they are in built-up areas. It follows based on this judgement that rural residential gardens are previously developed land and that the site is previously developed land. It is appreciated that this judgement may be tested in the Court of Appeal and beyond. However, given the planning history of the site and its location as part of a group of houses it is contended that it would be reasonable to exclude the site from the Green Belt and include it within the proposed Village Infill Development Boundary.	
PO670	Dr John Pears				Rushton Spencer	Object	There is no justification for proposing infill on green belt land in and around Rushton Spencer. I object to the use of green belt land for housing on principle, but especially in this case where the number of new houses required by the plan for Rushton Spencer can be easily met by in fill from other land which is not green belt.	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.
PO1185	Mr Malcolm Matravars				Rushton Spencer	Object	I do not believe that the development boundary should be extended to include any green belt areas as it is determined to be a village. Similarly, as behind the area behind the Ivy House between Sugar Street is about to be developed, the area of land between Sugar Street, Macclesfield Road, and alley Lane would result in over development in that part of the village	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.
PO1478	Mr Malcolm Matravars				Rushton Spencer	Object	I do not believe that it is necessary to extend the development infill boundary to include the green belt The Jim Hallam site for green public open sensible site for the green open public space and should not be used for development	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.
PO1227	Mrs Amanda Hughes				Rushton Spencer	Object	The infill boundary should be changed to exclude the land at the vicarage 7 land between alley lane& Leek old road. The rationale is that development ongoing opposite this site will already cause chaos to the road structure. No, not all cars can be accommodated easily. I am also against losing green field areas & therefore would be grateful infill excluding	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.
PO868	Mr Robin				Rushton	Object	All development should be on brownfield sites. RS005 should not be included as	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
	Foschtinski				Spencer		it's redesignation from field to garden has already been turned by the Planning Inspector as it is a prominent site with a visual impact on the whole village. It is also much too steep to be developed without excessive terracing and stabilisation of the hillside. RS009 is in the Greenbelt contributes greatly to the rural nature of the village and is prone to frequent flooding. There are an adequate number of infill sites to the west of this site whose development would have little impact on the character of the village.	infill boundary.
PO4832	Mrs Donna Kettle				Rushton Spencer	Object	I would like to make a formal representation on the Staffordshire Moorland Local Plan Site Allocation document. I understand that the formal consultation period has now closed, but unfortunately I was not aware of it at the time. I hope you will be able to take any comments into account, and the published timetable on your website suggests that this should be possible, particularly given that their focussed nature. If you are not able at this time, then I will send them through again as a formal representation on the Publication version of the plan. Could you add my details to your consultation basis so that I can be kept informed of future stages and opportunities for involvement?' I would like to see an amendment to the infill boundary for Rushton Spencer, so that it includes the site shown on the attached plan. This would be a very minor modification that would be fully consistent with the plan strategy and the Green belt designation. The site is surrounded by existing buildings on one side and trees on the others, and a barely visible from the road or the other parts of the Green Belt. A small infill development on this site would have no material impact on the openness of the Green Belt, but would form a coherent part of the existing village and would be clearly within its boundaries. The large garage and forecourt on the opposite side of the road is a highly urbanising feature, extending the built up area of the village beyond this site. Furthermore, the building on the main road frontage immediately to the South-East of the site is very prominent given its proximity to the road, its height, and views of its North-West elevation. In this context, the visual impact of any development on this site would be negligible, particularly as it would be set back from the main road. The inclusion of the site within the infill boundary would therefore be fully consistent with the protection of the character of Rushton Spencer and the openness of the Green Belt. It would also be consistent with the approach to rural areas set out in the adopted Core Strategy, delivering the sensitive growth referred to on page 42. This site would provide an opportunity to gradually increase the housing supply in the village without any significant adverse impacts. The draft plan includes an assumption that a average of 30 net additional dwellings per annum will come forward on village infill sites, providing a total of 570 additional dwellings over a 19 year period. Although it covers 41 villages, this would seem quite optimistic giving the site allocations in the other villages are in addition to it. It will therefore be important to take all the opportunities to deliver sustainable housing developments within the villages, and this site provides a low impact opportunity. It is also notable that this site performs well in comparison to other land within the infill boundary for Rushton Spencer that could be subject to applications for residential development on land East of The Knott Inn. In summary, this site provides an ideal opportunity to support a modest in the housing supply within Rushton Spencer in a way that has negligible impact on the openness of the Green	See response to PO213 regarding Rushton Spencer infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							Belt and is consistent with both local and national planning policy.	
Stockton Brook								
PO557	Mr Nicholas Mountford	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Stockton Brook	Object	Land to the north of Leek Road, Stockton Brook, Stoke-on-Trent, ST9 9NW. On behalf of my client, the site owner, Mr Nicholas Mountford of Quarry House Farm, Moss Hill, Stockton Brook, Stoke-on-Trent, ST9 9NW I object to the omission of an area of land north of Leek Road, Stockton Brook from the proposed Infill Development Boundary for Stockton Brook and ask that the site is released from the Green Belt and included in the Infill Development Boundary. The site was not submitted as part of the Site Options Consultations in 2015 but the site is well situated in terms of communications, services, the wider area and the village. The site is situated close to the junction of Moss Hill and Leek Road and runs to the north and north-west from Leek Road up to modern housing at Heather Hills and west to Moss Hill. There are houses and the village hall along the frontage of Moss Hill opposite the site and residential development and services on the other side of Leek Road which is a regular bus route between Hanley and Leek. Immediately opposite the site on the opposite side of Leek Road is Stockton Brook Post Office and shop. To the north of the site is an area of about 45 modern houses stretching into the countryside towards Brown Edge and towards Endon. A location plan showing the site boundaries is submitted separately by email. At the Leek Road/Moss Hill cross-roads there are a barbers, a beauty shop and a kitchen and bedroom fitters shop. There is a Spar grocery shop at a petrol station at Baddeley Green which is about 350-400 metres away to the west along Leek New Road. About 95 metres to the west of Moss Hill is the Caldon Canal Conservation Area and Green Belt land. To the east of the proposed site the land consists of Green Belt pasture fields. Quarry House Farm (house, outbuildings and stables) is located in the north west of the site and the house garden stretches down almost the full frontage on Moss Hill. The site is situated in the Green Belt and there is a formal row of lime trees along the entire southern (Leek Road) frontage of the site, a row of deciduous trees along part of the western frontage onto Moss Hill; an informal line of trees along the northern boundary with Heather Hills; and a mature hedgerow along the entire eastern boundary. There are a number of mature deciduous trees in the northern part of the hedge along the eastern boundary. There is also an isolated tree near to the Quarry House stables. All the trees mentioned are protected by Tree Preservation Order. There is an access to the site and to Quarry House Farm off Moss Hill and a plan (No.00554_AL(0)03 showing the current access has been sent separately by email. This latter drawing also shows the visibility splays for the access. This access could be moved further northwards to improve the visibility splays. Drawing No.00554_AL(0)04 shows a potential access further to the north on Moss Hill which has better sight-lines. It is also proposed that a further access could be created onto Leek Road. Two drawings (No's No.00554_AL(0)01 and No.00554_AL(0)02) show two possible alternative access points. The first of these drawings shows the access constructed at the point where there is an existing gate. There is also a possibility that an alternative access could be provided further east along Leek Road – see later. The impact of these access points on the protected trees is discussed later in this	Stockton Brook is washed over by Green Belt. The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in Green Belt is inappropriate, however limited infilling in villages is listed as an exception. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy (including Green Belt policy) and other policies in the Local Plan.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							document. The Green Belt Review commissioned by the Council split the Green Belt into sub-zones assessed the contribution each sub-zone made to the Green Belt purposes. The proposed site lies in sub-zone N22 with sub-zone N21 immediately to the west. The Review considers that both sub-zones make a significant overall contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. In particular, it is considered that the sub-zones make a significant contribution to checking unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding from encroachment; make a contribution to assisting regeneration in Stoke; and make a limited contribution to preventing towns merging and the setting of towns. The Review describes the two sub-zones together with parcels N19 and N20 as forming an arc of parcels preventing the absorption of Brown Edge and Endon into the Stoke-on-Trent conurbation to the south-west. Mr Mountford asks that the site is omitted from the Green Belt and included in the proposed Village Development Boundary for the following reasons: Assessment of the impact of possible development on the site. The area of modern housing to the immediate north of the site already stretches towards Brown Edge and Endon. Looking from Leek Road this housing appears, and is generally accepted, as being part of Stockton Brook, The eastern boundary of the proposed site extends only slightly further eastwards than the modern housing the eastern boundary of which is demarcated by mature tree planting and for part of its length by a road. A similar approach could be adopted on this potential site with access in the south-east of the site onto Leek Road and a road and substantial tree planting forming the eastern boundary. All houses would be to the west of this road and tree planting. Development of the land would fill a gap between existing developments and as such it would not extend development towards Brown Edge and not add to the absorption of Brown Edge into the Stoke conurbation. With regard to reducing the gap between Stoke and Endon the modern houses to the north already extend towards Endon and whilst the site boundary lies slightly to the east of that of the houses to the north this could be tree planted and the reduction in the gap between Stockton Brook and Endon would be minimal. Whilst development on the site would create a break in the Green Belt between east and west the Green Belt would sweep around the site on either side and the rural feeling of the area would remain. Residential development on the site would appear as a part of the village and would not be discordant or have a significant visual impact or impact on the overall openness of the Green Belt or the character of the Green Belt. It is contended that if the site were to be developed it would not add to sprawl nor would be encroachment but would be a consolidation of existing development between two existing parts of the village. Both sub-zones 21 and 22 are described in the Green Belt review as making a limited contribution to preventing towns merging and the setting of towns. In terms of assisting regeneration it is considered that development of this site would have a limited effect as it would form part of the housing figure/targets for the District. Overall, it is contended that whilst the development of the site would mean loss of some of the Green Belt it would not have a major impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would, for the reasons outlined above, not conflict significantly with the purposes of the Green Belt given that the shortage of deliverable housing land in the Borough amounts to exceptional circumstances. The site, compared to most, if	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							not all the small villages in the Moorland, is well placed with respect to services. There are two regular bus services along leek Road; Hanley to Leek and Hanley to Buxton. Immediately opposite the site is the village post office and local shop. There is a grocery (Spar) shop about 400 metres walk away towards Stoke. There is also a barber, a beauty shop and a kitchen fitters shop nearby. There are various small shops further along the road to Stoke and Hanley and restaurants nearby. There are doctors' surgeries relatively nearby in Baddeley Green and Endon and there is a primary school (Greenways PS) about 530 metres away to the south-west and primary and secondary schools in Endon the nearest of which is about a kilometre away. There is a children's nursery (Moorlands Nursery) about 250 metres towards Endon on Leek Road. The site is about 1.8 hectares in size and could accommodate between 44-50 houses at average densities. The number of houses could be less if the density of development was lower. The Council's policies would require the provision of affordable housing as part of the development. The site is a particularly good one for affordable housing because of the range of services locally. As described earlier there are several potential access points. Those alternatives on Leek Road would need to go through the row of lime trees on the frontage. A small number of trees may need to be removed to construct a road but as drawings no's. No.00554_AL(0)01 and No.00554_AL(0)02) reveal it would be possible to prune the trees to create the necessary visibility. On Moss Hill the re-located access (drawing no. 00554_AL(0)04) shows that adequate visibility can be created northwards and whilst a wall obstructs a small part of the visibility splay this wall belongs, I believe, to the Parish Council and it may be possible to negotiate a reduction in its height. Also, traffic approaching from the south would be on the opposite side of the road and would be visible within the required distances. The vast majority of the lime trees along the Leek Road frontage would be retained and designed as an integral part of the any scheme as would the other protected trees on the site. Part of the site is already in residential use – Quarry House Farm. Overall, it is contended that the benefits of a development on the proposed site would outweigh the disbenefits.	
PO919	Mr Nick Mountford	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Stockton Brook	General comment	Site ADD008 - Land to the north of Leek Road, Stockton Brook, Stoke-on-Trent, ST9 9NW. On behalf of my client, the site owner, Mr Nicholas Mountford of Quarry House Farm, Moss Hill, Stockton Brook, Stoke-on-Trent, ST9 9NW I object to the omission of Site ADD008 from the proposed Infill Development Boundary for Stockton Brook and ask that the site is released from the Green Belt and included in the Infill Development Boundary. The site, which is well situated in terms of communications, services, the wider area and the village, was not submitted as part of the Site Options Consultations in 2015 but was submitted later as an additional site (ref:ADD008) and is assessed in the Site Options Assessment document. The recommendation in the Options Assessment was that the site is constrained and should not be released from the Green Belt. The issues raised in the Options Assessment are addressed later in this response. The site is situated close to the junction of Moss Hill and Leek Road and runs to the north and north-west from Leek Road up to modern housing at Heather Hills and west to Moss Hill. There are houses and the village hall along the frontage of Moss Hill opposite the site and residential development and services on the other side of Leek Road	See response to PO557 regarding Stockton Brook infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							which is a regular bus route between Hanley and Leek. Immediately opposite the site on the opposite side of Leek Road is Stockton Brook Post Office and shop. To the north of the site is an area of about 45 modern houses stretching into the countryside towards Brown Edge and towards Endon. A location plan showing the site boundaries is submitted separately by email. At the Leek Road/Moss Hill cross-roads there are a barbers, a beauty shop and a kitchen and bedroom fitters shop. There is a Spar grocery shop at a petrol station at Baddeley Green which is about 350-400 metres away to the west along Leek New Road. About 95 metres to the west of Moss Hill is the Caldon Canal Conservation Area and Green Belt land. To the east of the proposed site the land consists of Green Belt pasture fields. Quarry House Farm (house, outbuildings and stables) is located in the north west of the site and the house garden stretches down almost the full frontage on Moss Hill. The site is situated in the Green Belt and there is a formal row of lime trees along the entire southern (Leek Road) frontage of the site, a row of deciduous trees along part of the western frontage onto Moss Hill; an informal line of trees along the northern boundary with Heather Hills; and a mature hedgerow along the entire eastern boundary. There are a number of mature deciduous trees in the northern part of the hedge along the eastern boundary. There is also an isolated tree near to the Quarry House stables. All the trees mentioned are protected by Tree Preservation Order. There is an access to the site and to Quarry House Farm off Moss Hill and a plan (No.00554_AL(0)03 showing the current access has been sent separately by email. This latter drawing also shows the visibility splays for the access. This access could be moved further northwards to improve the visibility splays. Drawing No.00554_AL(0)04 shows a potential access further to the north on Moss Hill which has better sight-lines. It is also proposed that a further access could be created onto Leek Road. Two drawings (No's No.00554_AL(0)01 and No.00554_AL(0)02) show two possible alternative access points. The first of these drawings shows the access constructed at the point where there is an existing gate. There is also a possibility that an alternative access could be provided further east along Leek Road – see later. The impact of these access points on the protected trees is discussed later in this document. The specific Green Belt Review information relating to this site is not provided in the Preferred Sites and Boundaries document although the Green Belt Review recommendation is mentioned in the Site Options Assessment document. Therefore, it is difficult to comment directly on the Review's recommendation. However, the Green Belt Review split the Green Belt into sub-zones and assessed the contribution each sub-zone made to the Green Belt purposes. The comments on the Green Belt below are, in the reasons for Mr Mountford's objection, made based on the information on the sub-zones in the Review. The proposed site lies in sub-zone N22 with sub-zone N21 immediately to the west. The Review considers that both sub-zones make a significant overall contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. In particular, it is considered that the sub-zones make a significant contribution to checking unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding from encroachment; make a contribution to assisting regeneration in Stoke; and make a limited contribution to preventing towns merging and the setting of towns. The Review describes the two sub-zones together with parcels N19 and N20 as forming an arc of parcels	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							preventing the absorption of Brown Edge and Endon into the Stoke-on-Trent conurbation to the south-west. Mr Mountford asks that the site is omitted from the Green Belt and included in the proposed Village Development Boundary for the following reasons : 1. Assessment of the impact of possible development on the Green Belt. The area of modern housing to the immediate north of the site already stretches towards Brown Edge and Endon. Looking from Leek Road this housing appears, and is generally accepted, as being part of Stockton Brook, The eastern boundary of the proposed site extends only slightly further eastwards than the modern housing the eastern boundary of which is demarcated by mature tree planting and for part of its length by a road. A similar approach could be adopted on this potential site with access in the south-east of the site onto Leek Road and a road and substantial tree planting forming the eastern boundary. All houses would be to the west of this road and tree planting. Development of the land would fill a gap between existing developments and as such it would not extend development towards Brown Edge and not add to the absorption of Brown Edge into the Stoke conurbation. With regard to reducing the gap between Stoke and Endon the modern houses to the north already extend towards Endon and whilst the site boundary lies slightly to the east of that of the houses to the north this could be tree planted and the reduction in the gap between Stockton Brook and Endon would be minimal. Whilst development on the site would create a break in the Green Belt between east and west the Green Belt would sweep around the site on either side and the rural feeling of the area would remain. Residential development on the site would appear as a part of the village and would not be discordant or have a significant visual impact or impact on the overall openness of the Green Belt or the character of the Green Belt. It is contended that if the site were to be developed it would not add to sprawl nor would be encroachment but would be a consolidation of existing development between two existing parts of the village. Both sub-zones 21 and 22 are described in the Green Belt review as making a limited contribution to preventing towns merging and the setting of towns. In terms of assisting regeneration it is considered that development of this site would have a limited effect as it would form part of the housing figure/targets for the District. Overall, it is contended that whilst the development of the site would mean loss of some of the Green Belt it would not have a major impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would, for the reasons outlined above, not conflict significantly with the purposes of the Green Belt given that the shortage of deliverable housing land in the Borough amounts to exceptional circumstances. The Site Options Assessment implies that the site may have an impact on the function of the Green Belt as a whole but without the site specific review it is difficult to comment precisely. However, it strongly contended that this would not be the case for the reasons described in the preceding paragraphs. Development on the site would not reduce the Green Belt between the existing development on Moss Hill and Stoke; it would “square off” and consolidate development linking the housing to the north to the built-up area south of Leek Road without protruding significantly beyond the eastern boundary of the existing housing to the north. Whilst development on the site could not be considered to be limited infill houses in practice it would in practice be “infill” of what is a gap between existing built	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							development without significantly impinging on either the openness or the key purposes of the Green Belt. 2. Access to Services, Facilities and Employment Contrary to the comments in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal Report the site is well placed with respect to services. The Appraisal states that the site is inaccessible to services and facilities. This is not correct. In fact it is much better served than most, if not all of the small villages in Moorlands. There are many services nearby - many within walking distance - and the site is on a regular bus route. The site is situated immediately to the north of the A53 (Leek Road) which is the main route between Leek and Hanley and Stoke. There are two regular bus services along Leek Road; Hanley to Leek and Hanley to Buxton. Immediately opposite the site is the village post office and local shop. There is a grocery (Spar) shop about 400 metres walk away towards Stoke. There is also a barber, a beauty shop and a kitchen fitters shop nearby. There are various small shops further along the road to Stoke and Hanley and restaurants nearby. There are doctors' surgeries relatively nearby in Baddeley Green and Endon and there is a primary school (Greenways PS) about 530 metres away to the south-west and primary and secondary schools in Endon the nearest of which is about a kilometre away. There is a children's nursery (Moorlands Nursery) about 250 metres towards Endon on Leek Road. 3. The site is about 1.8 hectares in size and could accommodate between approximately 40 houses at average densities. The number of houses could be less if the density of development was lower. The Council's policies would require the provision of affordable housing as part of the development. The site is a particularly good one for affordable housing because of the range of services locally. 4. The Sustainability Appraisal Report states that the site is inaccessible to existing employment areas. It is contended that this is incorrect. The bus journeys from Stockton Brook to Hanley and Leek take about minutes respectively 5. As described earlier there are several potential access points. Those alternatives on Leek Road would need to go through the row of lime trees on the frontage. A small number of trees may need to be removed to construct a road but as drawings no's. No.00554_AL(0)01 and No.00554_AL(0)02) reveal it would be possible to prune the trees to create the necessary visibility. On Moss Hill the re-located access (drawing no. 00554_AL(0)04) shows that adequate visibility can be created northwards and whilst a wall obstructs a small part of the visibility splay this wall belongs, I believe, to the Parish Council and it may be possible to negotiate a reduction in its height. Also, traffic approaching from the south would be on the opposite side of the road and would be visible within the required distances. 6. The vast majority of the lime trees along the Leek Road frontage would be retained and designed as an integral part of the any scheme as would the other protected trees on the site. 7. Part of the site is already in residential use – Quarry House Farm. 8. Overall, it is contended that the benefits of a development on the proposed site would outweigh the disbenefits.	
PO3888	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			Stockton Brook	Object	On behalf of my client I wish to object to the exclusion of my client's land [SB014 and other land] from the proposed residential infill boundary for Stockton Brook, as it is considered that the site is surrounded by residential development and its inclusion within the infill boundary would present opportunities for a low density form of development to come forward that will respect and reinforce the spacious	See response to PO557 regarding Stockton Brook infill boundary.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Infill Boundary	Support Object General comment	Consultee comments	Officer Response
							character of the surrounding area. [Two attachments submitted].	
PO9572	Mr & Mrs Thomas Bloor				Stockton Brook	Object	The Council wrote to us last year regarding the fact that the council officers in your team were considering the use of our land (see attached plan - land is marked in red) for housing development. Following the council's identification of the possibility of being included in the proposed infill area for Stockton Brook, the land was included in the Site Options Consultation held in 2015. However, the Preferred Options document excludes our land from the infill boundary. The current infill proposal for Stockton Brook is directly adjacent to our boundary on two aspects (east and south) with the other two boundaries (west and north) having existing housing located directly adjacent. We do not understand why the current infill boundary appears to exclude our property and suggest that it makes more sense if the boundary is "squared off" to the west of Willfield Lane as shown on the attached plan.	See response to PO557 regarding Stockton Brook infill boundary.
Whiston								
PO825	Ms Alison Conybear e				Whiston	Object	Why has the boundary to the north of the garage extended into the field? This should remain close to the garage buildings as previously.	Whiston has an infill boundary defined in the 1998 Local Plan. The proposed approach is no longer to identify a defined infill boundary on the policies map for smaller villages and to determine decisions on planning applications on a case by case basis in accordance with Policy H1 – New Housing Development, having regard to national planning policy and other policies in the Local Plan.
PO9516	Mr Paul Housiaux				Whiston	Object	(Summary of response) Object to the ongoing consultation process and how it affects the village boundary of Whiston. 1. SMDC does not have a sound Core Strategy that provides the basis for the Site Allocations process. SMDC is both out of time and has failed to comply with the required process. 2. SMDC has failed to comply with the strict requirements of consultation and is therefore invalid as to procedural requirements, NPPF and the Localism Act. 3. Lack of documents at the consultation events.	Comments noted. The Core Strategy was found sound and is adopted.

Question 35: Do you have any comments on the visual and public open spaces for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
General								
PO2570	Mrs Maggie Taylor	Planning Manager Sport England			All	Object	I note some of the open space designations are formal sports facilities (which is supported) but it is very important that all sports sites are captured otherwise those excluded will have lesser protection. I note that the Football Ground off Orchard Court/Grace Street for example is not designated whereas the cricket club site just to the north is - why? I also note that the playing fields associated with the secondary school are not designated – should they not be? It will be important to clarify what is designated and why (or why not) and to ensure all playing fields are clearly protected (as it is a defined function/use of open space), whether it is in Council ownership or not (Birchall Playing Fields appears to be included?) so there is a consistent level of protect for all open space, whatever its use. This principle applies across ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS.	The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work.
PO2865	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council			All	Object	In relation to the areas of Open Space identified throughout the site options document it is noted that all school playing fields have been categorised as open space, some in their entirety and others appear to only include certain parts. There is no definition in the plan as to what 'Open Space' constitutes or whether it needs to be accessible to the general public. As the Plan progresses it is unclear what policy restrictions may be imposed to such land. We therefore reserve out position on 'Open Space' at school fields and suggest that further discussion is required on whether the identification of school playing fields as 'Open Space' is required given the protection afforded to playing fields already through National Planning legislation and school premises legislation?	- Not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'. - See response to PO2570.
PO1291	Justin Milward	Lead Government Affairs Officer (Local), Woodland Trust			All Sites	Support	Support provision of Open Space in the Local Plan. (Further detail in the attached comments).	Support noted.
PO430	Mr David John Allen				General - all	General comment	Open Space should be part of any reasonable size development.	Comment noted.
Alton								
PO1346	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Alton	General comment	Consideration should be given to protecting key areas with Visual Open Space status.	The Council's Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) has recommended sites for inclusion as Local Green Space.
Blythe Bridge								
PO877	mr jonathan broadhurst				BB041	Object	As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it.	The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016).

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs.	See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BE041.
PO879	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		BB041	Object	As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs.	See response to PO977 regarding site BB041.
PO886 PO893	Miss Emily Broadhurst mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst mrs diane broadhurst		BB041	Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As it stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult on. As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BE041.
Cheddleton								
PO171	Mr Steve Wood				CD019 CD115	Object	Although these two plots (CD019 and CD115) have been dropped from consideration, I feel that if there were a need for alternative plots that these two would still not be suitable.	Comments noted. CD019 and CD115 were included as possible housing options sites but were not included as a preferred housing site in the 2016

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							As you drive or walk through the "S" bend in the road between these two sites it is clear and with large open aspects. If you were to infill these areas you would make it into a chicane type road, with houses both side of the road from here and all the way down the bank in cheddleton. This would block the openness completely. Also according to Leek Heritage, Heath house farm CD115 and Holly house farm CD019 are some of the oldest houses in Cheddleton and remain little changed after all these years. It would be a shame to change that now when other plots, if needed could be used. I don't think these should be used in reserve.	preferred options sites and boundaries consultation.
PO2	Mr Peter Blakeman				cheddleton	Object	The development will have adverse effects on a huge number of properties exacerbated by the small gardens of the properties. These include but are not limited to overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy. The diminished visual open space entering the area has negative connotations on the perception of the area.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 and CD003.
PO277	Mrs Shirley Sugars		Mr Paul Sugars		Cheddleton - south of Caudon Canal opposite western end of Churnetside Business Park	Object	The designation of the land south of the Caudon Canal, immediately east of the Red Lion public house and south of the western end of the Churnetside Business Park as Public Open Space is incorrect. This land is privately owned and has been for many years and is therefore NOT Public Open Space. Furthermore the site does not conform to the definition of Visual Open Space ("VOS") contained in the Review of Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment of Staffordshire Moorlands. The site does not allow the public to enjoy significant internal and external views across the open area. The site itself is overgrown scrubland and the views beyond it are to the highly industrialized and unattractive Churnetside Business Park. The site has no amenity or recreational value to the public, nor would it do so if there was a public right of access to it, which there is not. The site does not contribute to the character of the surrounding neighbourhood or settlement. Accordingly it cannot and should not be designated as VOS.	- The land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. - The site has been assessed in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 31 Section A). It is described as a large open space that rises up from the canal which is visually prominent and provides a gap in development. It was not found to be suitable for a Local Green Space designation but it is suggested in the document that it could be protected under a different designation within the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
PO8240	Mr R Duncan	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy			CN01	Object	Submits report [attached doc and map] on behalf of Sugden Homes Ltd. Report is made in respect of the parcel of Visual Open Space at Ox Pasture, Cheddleton and seeks to demonstrate that this site is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development, and that the proposed visual open space designation should be removed. Report: disagrees with the conclusions of the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment that this site should remain as Visual Open Space; re-affirms client's commitment to releasing part of this land for designation as Public Open if remainder can be considered for residential purposes; states a means of vehicular access to this site from Ox Pasture to the south has furthermore been agreed [refer	- The land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. - The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 29). It is considered that the site provides very attractive views from the footpath on southern boundary out towards wider countryside (including the church and roaches). It is also tranquil and there is wildlife value in hedgerows. It is recommended that the whole site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							to map attachment].	
PO211	Mr Kevin Benfield				The strip of land fronting Churnet Canal to west of The Boat Inn Cheddleton, which includes the terraced cottages fronting the canal & land to the north of dwellings on Cheddleton Park Avenue	General comment	Generally support this inclusion. However, some is shown POS & other Visual Open Space. I feel that if you are to look at this land the POS allocation would be greater as there are footpaths which link the land to residents who live on Cheddleton Park Ave & the wider village. I have previously written to the Enforcement Officer regarding the present use & development of this land. (Amended) However, I am concerned that this land adj the end cottage continues to be developed & maintained so that its appearance becomes more built-up & residential & less "open"/natural. Therefore, whilst I support the allocation of such land I am concerned that your designation will be undermined by activities of residents, who may not be the land owners, which will lead to further development of the canal/water frontage to the visual detriment of this part of the village. I'm not sure of land ownership in this area.....Parish Council....Local Authority...Canal Trust....One of the Cottages????	Support noted. The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 32). It is considered that the site has high wildlife value, important for setting of the Cauldon Canal Conservation Area. Canal towpath well used by walkers. It is recommended that the site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances.
Draycott								
PO942	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw				Draycott	General comment	I was quite amused to see what is deemed as public open space in Draycott. The church and graveyard, the old primary school which is now a special school and the area owned and run by Draycott Sports Centre. Apart from the church area none of the other areas are actually open to the public. There is no public play space for children in the village - Staffordshire County Council kindly sold off the only small area at the front corner of the old primary school when they sold the land the school stands on. It's not accessible now to local people and the actual play area is shortly being converted to a playground to take the 30+ staff cars for the special school.	- The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes an updated playing pitch strategy. Any inconsistencies will be investigated as part of this updated work. - Not all the open spaces marked on the map are accessible to the public and should be indicated as 'open space' rather than 'public open space'.
PO201	Mrs Jacqueline Leach				OC055	Object	This is in a Special Landscape Area. There are several red listed birds which were not considered. Lapwings, Skylarks and Curlews, brown hares, grass snakes etc. There is also St Mary's Church which is a grade 2 listed building. This was also not considered.	This site has outline planning approval.
PO1032	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	OC055	Object	Again this area has not been included. It is in a Special Landscape area with a Grade 2 listed building that has not been considered, many red listed species that have not been considered and a medieval water meadow which entices these species that also has not been considered.	This site has outline planning approval.
Endon								
PO996 PO983	Mrs H Sullivan Mr M Sullivan				Adjacent to EN012	Object	Open Space Regular communications from local MPs of all parties have referred to cases of antisocial behaviour and the need for more and improved open spaces and recreational areas for children and youths in the area. Such	- The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes provision for children and young people. - See response to Question 37 – housing

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO991	Mr Oliver Sullivan						communications have indicated that there is already limited space available. The park area adjacent to proposed site EN012 would be fully enclosed by this housing development and when the other sites proceed, will be unable to respond to the demand from a further 131 properties. As such, any proposal to build so many properties in a village area should be accompanied by a proposal to extend the current recreational and open space available to the local residents.	allocation EN012.
PO3906	Mr J Silitlito				EN012	Object	Designated green belt – should be left alone – no need to encroach Skyline development – current homes below skyline Impact on wildlife.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN012.
PO174	Mrs Heather Djuranovic				EN128	Object	The site has been designated a Visual Open Space for at least 20+ years. Regardless of what any owner of the space may do to restrict the visual impact, e.g. planting trees/hedges, the site remains a visual open space. This site occupies a visually prominent position and contributes to the spaciousness of this area. Any building on this site would harm the openness, character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not add visual value to the area. To build on this site would urbanise the area even further and impact detrimentally on the village character. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states that pursuing sustainable development also involves seeking positive improvements to the quality of the built and natural environment. All previous planning applications to change the use of this land have been turned down. Even stables were turned down! How can such a significant change be considered when this history is presented? The suggestion that a Semi detached house built in the 30's on Brookfield Avenue be knocked down to gain access would be of even further detriment to the visual feel of the area. I consider that site EN128 should retain its current 'Designated Visual Open Space' status which has been in operation for at least 30 years. The loss of this open space would be visually, aesthetically and environmentally detrimental to the surrounding built-up residential area.	- Whilst the site is currently identified as Visual Open Space, the site was not identified for retention as such in the 2008 Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. The Council is not obliged to retain this designation. Therefore the site was included as a potential housing option. - See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN128.
PO253	Mr and Mrs A.J. Eardley				EN128	Object	With specific regard to site EN128..... if these areas are classed as rural areas ... or even semi rural areas.... it is imperative to maintain the visual open spaces within the village or Endon will just become a suburb of Stoke. The health of the children at St Luke's Primary School is already compromised by the proximity of the main road, with the ever increasing volume of traffic, and to be hemmed in on both sides would only exacerbate things. This would equally apply to the health and well-being of adjacent residents.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN128.
Hollington								
PO685	mr ivor moseley				Hollington	General comment	Provision for parking for the village Hall and Church would be extremely welcome.	Core Strategy Policy C1 supports the enhancement of existing community facilities. Evidence of need

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
								would need to be demonstrated and this assessed against other potential impacts such as landscape, heritage, highways etc.
Kingsley Holt								
PO667	mrs karen parkin				mid churnet valley	Object	Draft reserve site off Lockwood Rd, Kingsley Holt for 50 dwellings. On southern slope of mid Churnet valley. Any development would have a significant & negative effect on the visual impact of valley.	Comments noted. There are no draft reserve sites included in Kingsley Holt.
Ladderedge								
PO1229	Mrs A Hollings				Ladderedge	Object	We are concerned that the proposed site goes well beyond the SCC depot and takes over the field adjacent which is currently a part off Ladderedge Country Park? We would also want an assurance that the access to the country park and no car park would be preserved.	Comments noted. Site LE249 covers the area of the depot only and does not extend into Ladderedge Country Park.
Werrington								
PO2051	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			Land off Whitmore Ave, Werrington	Object	SMDC has classed the following as 'open space' - Land off Whitmore Ave. Werrington Parish Council believes that land off Whitmore Avenue and Radley Way should be re-classified as potential housing	- The southern part of the land is privately owned and therefore should not be designated as Public Open Space. - The site has been assessed as Local Green Space (LGS) in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016) (Site 35). It is considered that the site has recreational value, clear paths and 3 points of public access. It is tranquil, away from roads and has some views out to the north. It also has wildlife value in the overgrown higher area. It is recommended that the site is designated as LGS meaning that new development would have to demonstrate very special circumstances.
PO1444 PO1462 PO1452 PO1455 PO1399 PO1449 PO1451 PO1456 PO1458	Ms Julie Whitehall Ms Jane Wheat Mr Albert Hodgetts Mrs Dorothy Hodgetts Mr B Hawe Ms S Hawe Mr E G Clewlow Mr & Mrs R Clapcott Mr A				Hillside Road/Lansdowne Cres, Werrington	Support	I wish to submit representations to the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan - draft Site Allocations and in particular wish to support the identification of the Visual and Public Open Space at Hillside Road/Lansdowne Crescent, Werrington (the Land). The Land has been identified in the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan as open space for a number of years and is a valuable piece of both public and visual open space in the middle of Werrington. The Land contains several footpaths which provide an important connection between the east and west of Werrington linking both Washerwall Lane and Moorland/Moss Park Avenue making a valuable contribution to the sustainability of the settlement. The Site Allocations Document itself demonstrates that there are very few areas of open space within the built up settlement of Werrington. Whilst Werrington is surrounded by the green belt and Wetley Moor Common these open spaces are only	See response to PO2051 regarding Local Green Space at Whitmore Avenue.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO1461	Bentley Mr M A Shingler						accessible to people who are able to access them and are not generally available to elderly people or those who are unable to drive/walk further afield. The Land provides an important accessible open space located close to existing residents and allows residents who are unable to access other further open spaces access to an immediately accessible form of open space. Green belt land is available on the periphery of Werrington that would adequately meet the need for new housing without affecting the openness of the greenbelt and avoiding the need to impact on existing open spaces which provide such an important facility for existing residents. It is clear that the need for new housing still cannot be met by using up all of the open spaces within Werrington to the detriment of existing residents of the settlement. The release of green belt land is inevitable to serve future generations of Werrington. The Land is a small site and would provide little contribution in meeting the identified housing need. In the 2008 assessment the Land was only 1 of 2 sites on the east of Washerwall Lane which were considered 'suitable' for identification as visual open space. We consider that the open space on the west of Washerwall located at Meigh Road is too far away to be able to add any value to the residents surrounding the Land or residents on the east side of Washerwall Lane. There has been no change of circumstances, appearance or use of the Land since the assessment in 2008 which would justify any change to the suitability of the Land for Visual Open Space. The suggestion that the identified need for housing can be met by building on all open space within the settlement is fundamentally flawed and completely fails to appreciate the need for new housing (and in particular starter homes) in Werrington. Such a strategy fails to understand the needs of the existing residents in the village and in particular certain groups of the community to have access to valuable open spaces. I therefore wish to support the identification of the Land as Visual and Public Open Space in the Site Allocations Document.	
PO9603 PO9602	Mr & Mrs Day Elks Cllr W Day				inbetween Lansdowne Crescent/ Moss Park Ave, Werrington	Support	Letter received [attached] SUPPORTING retention of this site as VOS/POS in Preferred Options: land serves substantial amount of existing housing land contains several footpaths, linking east and west of Werrington two recent residential refusals on this land - circumstances have not changed. Questions remain over suitability of site for housing, including whether safe access can be achieved 2008 VOS assessment considered land suitable for VOS retention - with high amenity value, etc. TPOs on site. 1 of only 2 such sites in village [but considers other Meigh Road site too far away from residents to serve them] With regards Council's updated VOS review,	See response to PO2051 regarding Local Green Space at Whitmore Avenue.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							consider above circumstances have not changed Core Strategy recognises important functions that VOS sites serve - therefore not appropriate to develop on them The site allocations document demonstrates a shortage of open space in the village (whilst there is adjacent Green Belt/Wetley Moor this is peripheral, not accessible to all). Existing open spaces are more accessible to residents Recognise need for new Werrington housing, but this should be through peripheral Green belt release [which I support]. Such peripheral sites are available without affecting the openness of the Green Belt - avoiding the need to develop existing open spaces that serve residents. Using such open spaces would be to the detriment of existing residents [and are small so housing yield would be small]. Green Belt release in village is inevitable to serve future generations. The allocation of larger Green Belt is more advantageous than smaller open spaces, because the former could attract more meaningful planning contributions (such as starter homes) Quotes NPPF para 74 regarding protecting of existing open spaces. This para makes no distinction between POS and VOS Council's recent open space assessment shows POS shortage across District, so loss of this site, would be contrary to policy. Further to para 74, any alternative reprovion would not be in a "suitable location" Even if the land were "unkempt", this would not be a reason to declassify as open space (Section 215 notices).	
PO1043	Mr Grant Anderson	Fradley Estates	Mr Grant Anderson		Open Space off Landsdowne Crescent/Hillside Road Werrington	General comment	We act on behalf of Fradley Estates which owns land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, Werrington (the Site). Fradley Estates is proposing the Site should be allocated as a housing site in Werrington (see our comments on questions 33, 36, 37 and 41 of the Preferred Options Sites and Boundaries Consultation exercise). Fradley Estates also owns land off Landsdowne Crescent/Hillside Road Werrington. Fradley Estates is keen to engage with the Council to discuss how the latter site might contribute as part of a comprehensive proposal in terms of contributing either to open space or low cost housing provision as part of a comprehensive proposal.	See response to PO2051 regarding Local Green Space at Whitmore Avenue.
Whiston								
PO826	Ms Alison Conybeare				Whiston	General comment	Why hasn't the jubilee garden and pinfold been identified as public open spaces?	The Council is undertaking a review of open space, sport and recreation facilities which includes a number of different 'typologies' of open space. In accordance with best practice recommendations a size threshold of 0.2 ha has been applied to the inclusion of some typologies.
PO2518	Mrs C Wainscott				Whiston N of A52	Object	I wish to object the allocation of public open space as shown on the attached plan as owner of this site. I would not be willing to dispose of this area for any other use that may be associated with the allocation and furthermore consider that	The area mapped in the preferred sites and boundaries consultation intended to relate to cemetery/churchyard land in conjunction with the Whiston Methodist Centenary Church. This has

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Area of visual/public open space	Support/object/ general comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							this location is unsuitable due to lack of access onto to the adjoining A5. The area is located on a periphery of the village of Whiston and distant from the main area around black lane and central village hall. Public open space located on this site would either pedestrians who would need to access the site along the busy A52 for pedestrians for which there is no footpath available without crossing the A52 or vehicular traffic which would require parking and access arrangements encroaching on an area that has always been countryside Topographically the site is dished forming a natural basin which is regularly water logged in winter and would be unsuitable for use during the winter months. There are clearly far more centralised easily accessible and drier sites available in Whiston which could provide the public open space deemed necessary by the LPA.	included land in private ownership by error. Amend area to reflect correct ownership.

Question 36: Do you have any comments on the suggested Green Belt amendments?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
General Comments								
PO565	Mr Peter Cowie					Object	All green belts should be preserved at all costs.	Comment noted.
PO2871	James Chadwick	Spatial Planning Policy Officer Staffordshire County Council				General comments	The proposed amendments to Green Belt are generally modest small scale amendments, which are considered likely to have limited effects on the wider area; however it is recommended that their appropriateness is considered in the context of local landform and vegetation pattern, to ensure that potential effects would be contained. Also recommended is that there is a requirement for an adequate buffer or new planting at the boundary between development and the countryside to ensure the remaining Green Belt is not eroded by development.	Comments noted. The Council's Landscape, Green Space and Heritage Impact Study(August 2016) includes a Landscape Assessment for each preferred option site and suggests site-specific landscape mitigation measures which includes planting.
Blythe Bridge								
PO202	Mrs Jacqueline Leach				BB041/ADD 011	Object	A huge amount of Green belt will be used up by the Northern Gateway and another area submitted for Blythe Bridge. Unacceptable	The Northern Gateway site is not located within the Green Belt.
PO181	Mr Brian Hannah				BB041/ADD 011	Object	As a resident of Forsbrook I chose to live in a green belt area. Now I see that taken away from me to build houses. There are sufficient brown belt areas within Stoke-on-Trent. MAKE USE OF THEM. this will have a direct effect on my quality of life.	The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. The Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess the district's full housing needs, including affordable housing, whilst taking into account migration and demographic change.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO402	Mr Roger Melville				BB041/ADD 011	Object	AD011 (BB041) Caverswall Old Road. In the original Shla document was Classified as a C and was dropped from the process because of its classification due to suitability and was not included in Last year's Consultation. Now it's a preferred site!! Owner of Site currently not known. Its agricultural land still being used for grazing. Within the Green Belt Study Report it has been classified as having a moderate overall impact on the Green Belt purposes of Development. In contrast BB044 Chapel St is not agricultural land never been used for grazing and within the Green Belt Study has been identified as having only limited impact on the Green Belt. Looking at the Development Capacity Study Housing Site Suitability Ranking Table . AD011 (BB041) Caverswall Old Road was Ranked no 132 across Moorlands With Category Rating of 3x Amber 1x Red. Compared to BB044 Chapel St which was ranked no 52 across the Moorlands. With Category Rating 2xGreen 2xAmber No Red. Highest ranked site in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge. Even higher than sites that has already been Developed. i.e. Smithfield site. Highways: Caverswall Old Rd into the village of Forsbrook is not too bad, however turning left out of the site heading towards the Potteries the road becomes very narrow in parts and at the junction of Caverswall Rd is quite dangerous, as identified by highways on assessment of site BB040. This would be residents preferred route to avoid Blythe Bridge cross roads and the railway crossing. Apart from any new residents Caverswall Old Road is already a busy road with through traffic both ways avoiding Blythe Bridge especially at commute times and School traffic to and from Caverswall. Surely BB044 Chapel Street would be a better site as it is a No Through Road its wider in most parts and only serves six dwellings to the north of the site so has very minimal traffic movement at any time of the day.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041 and response to PO375 regarding BB044.
PO872	mr jonathan broadhurst				BB041/ADD 011	Object	This is a valuable piece of green belt land. It is home to a diverse and varied wildlife habitat including plants, trees, birds, badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, toads and possibly newts (there are a number of ponds on the site). Some of the trees have tree preservation orders. There is a substantial amount of hedgerows throughout the site which shouldn't be destroyed. The public right of way through the site enables local people to enjoy the wildlife and countryside and the fabulous views which this site offers. It is essential that such beautiful greenbelt land is preserved for the wildlife and for future generations to enjoy. Far less ecologically valuable sites could be used for housing development. The public right of way also allows local people to walk between Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook without walking along lanes with no pavements, making it a safer option.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041.
PO1051	Mr David Nixon				BB041/ADD 011	Object	The inclusion of Site BB041 would be counter to the principle of the Green Belt in that it would infill and merge the two separate	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							settlements of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook ~ Blythe Bridge being a linear settlement following the Roman road and Forsbrook a nuclear settlement over the ridge at the valley bottom. This condition is highlighted in the Wardell Armstrong Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. In this drawing ST10553-7b points to the existing strong settlement edge for Blythe Bridge. Infilling of BB041 would be a confusing contradiction of this. Conversely Wardell Armstrong point to the more porous edge to the North of Forsbrook and recommend its reinforcement. This boundary has been excluded despite the 2015 Green Belt Review clearly identifying this as an area offering scope for some release of land for housing	
PO881	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		BB041/ADD 011	Object	The green belt within the rural areas needs to be protected; once it's gone, it's gone forever. There are better alternative sites on the original consultation eg BB021 - this site is not an ecologically diverse and beautiful area and would be better as residential housing than BB041. BB087 was also a better option than BB041. Wildlife such as foxes, badgers, owls and a wide variety of birds inhabit this site. Out of the two sites on the current proposal, BB054 would be preferential as it is not an ecologically diverse and does not have beautiful open views. Flooding - this area is prone to flooding. Caverswall Road is like a river during heavy rainfall. This collects at the bottom and it is frequently impassable to pedestrians and to cars. The other side of Caverswall Road between Blythe Bridge and Caverswall also regularly flood and cars get stranded or the road has to be closed. It was flooded again on 11.6.16 and impassable. Electricity cables currently run across the field adjacent to BB041 and across BB041. Some of these cables have recently been buried under the field. How would this affect these possible developments? Why wasn't BB041 on the previous proposal? People may well have made different comments had this been on the original proposal as some of the original sites may have been preferred over this particular site. As it stands, there are now only 2 sites to consult on.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041.
PO887	Miss Emily Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst					
PO894	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst					
PO887	Miss Emily Broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst		BB041/ADD 011	Object	As a visual open space this particular site is extremely valuable. The public have the right of way to pass through the centre of it which is important as it allows people to enjoy it. It is a beautiful area with an abundance of wildlife and plants, including very well established trees which we understand have preservation orders on them. These must be protected at all costs. Our garden gets saturated after heavy rainfall and any further developments near to our property would make this matter worse and interfere with the natural soakaway that the fields provide.	The site is not recommended for designation as Local Green Space in the Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (2016). Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB041.
PO894	mrs diane broadhurst		mrs diane broadhurst					
PO30	Miss Gabrielle Bailey				BB054	Object	This means more people which means more traffic which simply cannot be supported without complimentary infrastructure. The main roads through Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook are already	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							gridlocked at certain times of day with queues right back into Forsbrook waiting at the crossroads to Blythe Bridge. People park all the way down the main road in Blythe Bridge which means queues down the road as it's single file. Add this to waiting for the railway crossing at Blythe Bridge and what should be a short journey turns into one where you need to pack sandwiches! With new sites for housing and a massive area now allocated for building to support employment how on earth are residents supposed to get to work or indeed hope to cross Cheadle Road In Forsbrook village? It's dangerous and time consuming as it is. I haven't seen anything on the table as solutions to the infrastructure problems which need to be in place before or alongside any addition to the population. In addition I fundamentally object to green belt land being used when brownfield sites are available.	
PO38	Mr Daniel Newton				BB054	Object	I am objecting to the proposed site off Draycott Old Road for the following reasons: 1. The destruction on local nature; 2. Would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area;	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO262	Mrs S Allt				BB054	Object	I am against Government policy to build on greenbelt land. There is still brownfield available once you remove Greenbelt land there is no turning back. This has an impact on local wildlife, public access, people's leisure activities (this particular site is extremely popular with dog walkers) not to mention spoiling the view and local landscape. Whilst the Government have made changes to the policy it does not seem in the remotest bit fair for those people who have chosen and paid to live alongside greenbelt fields to have the rules changed and the land built on.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO435	Mrs Gillian Jackson				BB054	Object	This site is green belt with no definable boundaries which is currently used as a working farm with animals grazing practically all year round. Development of this site would be severely detrimental to the wildlife there. The brook at the bottom of this site frequently floods during heavy rainfall, additional housing would cause this to happen more often.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO782	Dr Jules Allt				BB054	Object	Development of this site would be another step of the villages expanding and coalescing. The villages are losing their defining boundaries. There is a public right of way across the site, in almost constant use by the public for walking / dog walking allowing enjoyment of the countryside. Development of the site with 70 properties would significantly increase traffic noise on Draycott Old Road and spoil the tranquil nature of the lane Development of the site would entail loss of natural habitat to wildlife, including hedgerow and trees	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO999	Ms Natasha Allt				BB054	Object	Taking this out of the greenbelt would lose a great area that is enjoyed by many locals, and allow the built up part of the village to move further up Draycott Old Road	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO1004	Mrs Carol Harrison				BB054	Object	This is a public green space, owing to the footpath on it, enjoyed by many, particularly dog walkers. I would be forced to walk up	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							the lane with no pavement to enjoy green pace instead. This would be more dangerous than currently because of increased traffic. It would allow creep of the village boundary up what is currently a lovely peaceful lane	
PO1070	Mr Thomas Allt				BB054	Object	There is a public right of way which I use to enjoy the countryside, and would not be the same if it was turned into a housing estate. I am worried that it would be the start of development of the lane away from the peaceful lane it is now	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
PO1014	Mrs Win Allt				BB054	Object	Poor choice of land to allow for release from green belt, further losing the definition between the villages. Loss of amenity use - I have enjoyed using the public footpath across this pleasant field.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BB054.
Brown Edge								
PO50	Mr P Rushton				BE041	Object	The proven need for additional homes in the SMDC area does not justify incursions into the present areas of green belt. The green belt countryside is the Staffs Moorlands greatest asset.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BE041.
PO1025 1	Mr Andy Brown	Harlequin Development Strategies (Crewe) Limited	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP	BE041	Support	The review of settlement and Green Belt boundaries required to apply the Core Strategy proposals i.e. releasing this land from the Green Belt is supported.	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BE041.
Biddulph Moor								
PO437	Miss Philippa Whalley				BM013	Object	Taking these 2 fields (they are actually two fields, and not one field as the plan shows) out of the Green Belt but leaving in sites BM020 and BM021, seems illogical as the other fields would also form a suitable village boundary and would allow suitable development against already relatively modern housing and a good ready built road.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BM013.
PO1022	Mr Leonard Hill				BM013	Object	I wish to object to the planning proposal BM013 in Biddulph Moor for the following reasons: 1) The site in question is within the green belt. No building should be allowed. 2) The proposed access onto Hot Lane would be a safety hazard. Most of that area off Hot Lane is single track and is unsuitable for extra traffic. 3) The proposed site is immediately opposite a children's playground and would present a significant danger to the children with additional traffic using hot lane. 4) A stream runs along side the Parklands and that area of land is subject to flooding after heavy rains, also extending in to Hot Lane. 5) Any further development off housing on Biddulph Moor should be limited to in fill only. Additional building to the area of BM013 would spoil the beauty of that area and lose its aspect the countryside	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation BM013.
Cheddleton								
PO2059	Mrs Lucinda Kavanagh				CD002	Object	I consider the removal; of site CD002 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD002.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2056	Mr and Mrs D Foster						Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD002 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote "to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks" The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD002 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMDC has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD002 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The Lockwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance". SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD002 as a potential site allocation for housing	
PO2084	Mrs Julie Wheel							
PO2079	Mr and Mrs D. Tellwright							
PO2058	Mrs Sandra Gaunt							
PO2111	Mr George James Tatton							
PO2091	Ms Monica Tatton							
PO2065	Mr Neil Adams							
PO2063	Ms Carol Adams							
PO2097	Mrs Janice Perkin							
PO2096	Mr and Mrs Reg Clowes							
PO2061	Mr and Mrs L Keates							
PO2054	Ms Ann Harrison							
PO2053	Mr Gordon Harrison							
PO2073	mr derek bailey							
PO2052	Mrs O Thorley							
PO2082	Mrs M Aston							
PO2080	Mr M Thorley							
PO2070	Mr S Clowes							
PO2071	Mr J Cooper							
PO2074	Miss G Cooper							
PO2075	Mr M Brindley							
PO2077	Mrs S Brindley							
PO2069	Mrs S Hathaway							
PO2068	Mr J Alcock							
PO2067	Mr And Mrs T Mellor							
PO2066	Mrs C Mellor							

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2055 PO2057 PO2090 PO2092 PO2093 PO2094 PO2095 PO2104 PO2106 PO2109 PO2110 PO2089 PO2114 PO2315 PO2107 PO2112 PO2320 PO2103 PO2086 PO2060 PO2062 PO2321 PO2311 PO2313	Mr R Bettany Mr G Foster Mrs J Humphreys Mr A Leonard Mr C Viggars Mrs R Viggars Mrs C Atkinson Mrs P Alcock Mrs B Hulse Mr R Perry Mrs B Perry Miss J Leonard Mrs G Eley Mr. Martyn Findlow Mrs D Bullock Mr and Mrs A Harrison Mr Joe Smith Mrs Doreen Tildesley T.C. Spragg Ms Judith Dean F.D. Rogers Mrs E Horne Ms C Knight-holland Alexander Harrison							
PO2362 PO2353 PO2351 PO2360 PO2327 PO2325	Mrs Susan Skittrell Mrs D Keeling Mr George Wheel Mrs A. Williams Mr P.A. Edwards Ms Emily				CD002	Object	I strongly object to CD002s inclusion in the local plan preferred options sites and boundary maps. I fully understand the need to develop a local plane however by including this site the SMDC has ignored. 1) Safety concerns relating to the A520 2) The requirements of the town and country planning regulation's 3) The views of the parish council 4) The views of the people living in Cheddleton. 5) The government policy to protect the green belt land 6) The lack of infrastructure, including schools and medical services 7) The spirit of the location act 2011 To expand. 1) The site is designated in green belt 2) This site doesn't align with the National Planning Policy Framework	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD002.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2337	Wheel Mrs M Turner						regarding Green Belt. This proposed will effectively join Cheddleton to Wetley Rocks and encroaches onto the countryside. Site CD002 and CD003 provide the only green space between the 2 villages. 3) This site does not meet the sustainability objectives as detailed in the national planning policy framework. 4) No consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from this site by foot or cycle. 5) Site has an infrequent bus service to the other parts of North Staffs 6) The A520 between Ostlers Lane Wetley Rocks has significant History of road accidents. On the data shows that there have been 22 accidents between 2005 and 2013, despite the installation of Cameras inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 7) The pavement on the A520 is narrow (less than 1m) and on 1 side only. Cars travel legally at 50 mph and it is considered that this does not form a safe walking route for those accessing it. Such as schools etc. in the village centre. 8) The junction off Folly Lane and Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 9) The site is 1.6 miles away from the catchment Primary schools. Given the lack of provisions for pedestrians, cycles and the infrequent bus service, the obvious method of accessing the schools and increase the Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 10) Schools in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in population and are currently full or have a small number of vacant places. This proposed residential development would require significant investment to address this issue. In addition further buses would be required to transport 5 to 13 pupils to Leek as there is no provision in the village. 11) It is considered that the existing utilities in this area could not sustain an increase in demand significant investment. This has not been considered. 12) Site has no substantial access to GP surgery. 13) It is known that the developer has attempted to coerce the Parish Council/SMDC for over approximately 20 years to support the release this site from Green Belt. Every attempt has previously been blocked by the parish council and residents of Cheddleton. This demonstrates the strength of feeling 14) Site has numerous trees that are known habitat wildlife, including a known bat population.	
PO2368	Mrs Helen Whitehouse							
PO2335	C Pegg							
PO2370	Mr and Mrs J Lindan							
PO2331	Mr M McCall							
PO2329	Mrs K McCall							
PO2382	Ms Tracy Williamson							
PO2372	Ms Dawn Hadley							
PO2333	Mr M Reeves							
PO2364	Mr MD Wootton							
PO2380	Mr B Bevington							
PO2378	Miss C Hollins							
PO2376	Mr M Hollins							
PO2323	Ms V Pegg							
PO2358	Mr Plimley							
PO2349	Mrs P Kelsall							
PO2347	Mr M Cunningham							
PO2345	Mr A Harrison							
PO2343	Mr A Cowdy							
PO2341	Mr And Mrs RJ/S Morris							
PO2339	Mrs B Knight							
PO278	Mrs Shirley Sugars		Mr Paul Sugars		CD002	Object	Development can be achieved in Cheddleton without encroachment onto Green Belt through the development of sites CD098, CD099 and CD088. These sites are all contiguous with existing developments and so pose no intrusion onto the Green Belt and can readily be connected with existing infrastructure. There is therefore no need for approval of site CD002 with its adverse ramifications for Green Belt development.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD002.
PO296	Ms Julie				CD002	Object	Removal of Green Belt land on this site would allow the	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
	Brownhill						coalescence of Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton. There is evidence of a bat population on the site. Curlew and Lapwing have been seen in the vicinity. Since both these species have 'red list' status it would be detrimental to the recovery of their population to allow development on this site. The removal of green belt status should only happen in 'exceptional circumstances'. The desire to build houses cannot be deemed 'exceptional'.	CD002.
PO322	Mr Greg Bicker				CD002	Object	CD002 according to the council's sustainability report is grade 4ALC green belt, development of which would be negative to the sites ecological importance. I am aware of nocturnal bat activity in the area and can see no evidence that a full bat survey has been carried out. Before further action is taken, public availability of detailed ecological reports needs to be provided.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD002.
PO310	Dr Gordon Wright				CD002	Object	CD002 is classified as grade 4 ALC, but it is rented by a local farmer. Building houses on this site would deprive the farmer of a valuable part of his resource in an already challenging environment. Allowing building on this site would make the largest village in Staffordshire contiguous with the much smaller village of Wetley Rocks.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD002.
PO4500	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			CD002	Support	The removal of sites CD002 and CD003 from the Green Belt are supported. [Refer to Question 1 attachments].	Support noted. See responses to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 and CD003.
PO3	Mr Peter Blakeman				CD003	Object	Greenbelt areas were created to stop neighbouring towns merging into one another. If the proposed sites CD002 and CD003 are used this removes any discernible boundary between Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton removing the original character of the separate towns. Tree protection orders should also be in place on the tree's and hedging running across the centre of the proposed sites discussed as they house a discernible amount of wildlife. Wildlife includes active bat roosts which have not been investigated or treated in line with Government guidelines so far.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO297	Ms Julie Brownhill				CD003	Object	Removal of Green Belt land on this site would allow the coalescence of Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton. There is evidence of a bat population on the site. Curlew and Lapwing have been seen in the vicinity. Since both these species have 'red list' status it would be detrimental to the recovery of their population to allow development on this site. The removal of green belt status should only happen in 'exceptional circumstances'. The desire to build houses cannot be deemed 'exceptional'.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO320	Mr Greg Bicker				CD003	Object	CD003 according to the council's sustainability report is grade 4ALC green belt, development of which would be negative to the sites ecological importance. I am aware of nocturnal bat activity in the area and can see no evidence that a full bat survey has been carried out, or a full ecological survey of the minor waterway that bisects the CD003 area. Before further action is taken, public availability of detailed ecological reports needs to be provided.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO313	Dr Gordon Wright				CD003	Object	The use of CD003 for housing would cause a great deal of noise and pollution for existing residents, who have long understood that this land would continue to be part of the green belt.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO584 PO932	Mrs Susan Buxton Mr John Buxton				CD003	Object	I most strongly object to amending the Green Belt at site CD003 which has previously been assessed as having a negative effect. This site has had planning permission refused in the past because of its importance as part of the Green Belt and the fact that it goes against at least 2 major principles of the Green Belt Policy. Including this site in the Local Plan would, in effect, join the two communities of Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks constituting a major coalescent. As an alternative, I would strongly support the recent application by John Pointon and Sons to vary the planning obligation of June 2010 and would urge the Council to allow the development of an already brownfield site, at what is known locally as Staffordshire Farmers, which would significantly contribute to the number of houses required by SMDC without amending the Green Belt and be more central to the village itself.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003. An application for residential development has been approved by planning committee (subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement) for the Staffordshire Farmers site (Jan 2017).
PO2178 PO2122 PO2172 PO2152 PO2149 PO2136 PO2130 PO2160 PO2127 PO2151 PO2148 PO2123 PO2139 PO2134 PO2138 PO2135	Ms Gaunt Mrs D Bullock Mr and Mrs A Harrison Mrs Doreen Tildesley T.C. Spragg F.D. Rogers Mrs Susan Skittrell Mrs Patricia Malkin Mr and Mrs D Foster Mrs Julie Wheel Mr and Mrs D. Tellwright Mr P.A. Edwards Mrs M Turner Mrs Helen Whitehouse Ms J Pegg Mr and Mrs J	St Lawrence's Church			CD003	Object	I consider the removal; of site CD003 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD003 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote “to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks” The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD003 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMDC has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2124	Lindan Mr George James Tatton						of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD003 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The lookwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance". SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD003 as a potential site allocation for housing	
PO2165	Ms Monica Tatton							
PO2118	Ms Tracy Williamson							
PO2176	Ms Carol Adams							
PO2115	Miss Cleo Malkin							
PO2171	Mrs Janice Perkin							
PO2170	Mr and Mrs Reg Clowes							
PO2153	Mr and Mrs L Keates							
PO2133	Mrs Dorothy Hampson							
PO2180	Ms Ann Harrison							
PO2179	Mr Gordon Harrison							
PO2157	mr derek bailey							
PO2146	Mrs O Thorley							
PO2147	Mr M Thorley							
PO2155	Mr S Clowes							
PO2156	Mr J Cooper							
PO2158	Miss G Cooper							
PO2161	Mr M Brindley							
PO2162	Mrs S Brindley							
PO2154	Mr J Alcock							
PO2173	Mr And Mrs T Mellor							
PO2119	Mrs C Mellor							
PO2164	Mrs J Humphreys							
PO2166	Mr A Leonard							
PO2167	Mr C Viggars							
PO2169	Mrs C							

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2128 PO2121 PO2163 PO2144 PO2142 PO2141 PO2129 PO2137 PO2132 PO2126 PO2140 PO2125 PO2143 PO2159 PO2142 PO2150	Atkinson Mrs B Hulse Mrs B Perry Mrs G Eley Mrs E Horne Mrs V Bettany Mr M Reeves Mr B Bevington Mr A Harrison Mr MD Wootton Miss C Hollins Mr M Hollins Mr P Jones Ms J Pegg Mrs S Hathaway Mrs V Bettany T.C. Spragg							
PO1894	Babb Family				CD003	Object	1. Safety concerns relating to the A520 2. The requirements of the Town & County Planning Regs.2012. 3.The views of the Parish Council. 4.The views of people living in Cheddleton. 5.The Government Policy to protect Green Belt. 6.The lack of Infrastructure, including schools & medical services. 7.The spirit of the Localism Act 2011. We strongly object to CD003. This is Green Belt Land. Reason houses weren't built previously as it was considered a danger some years ago. Now the roads are more congested. Plus it will affect properties values which people have worked long and hard to secure. Very limited 'bus service from this area.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO2159	Mrs S Hathaway				CD003	Object	Agree with all other objections	Comments noted.
PO2508 PO2479 PO2496 PO2504 PO2498 PO2506	Ms V.Margaret Redfearn Mr George Wheel Mr M McCall Ms Patricia Cunningham Mrs P Kelsall Mr A				CD003	Object	I strongly object to CD003s inclusion in the local plan preferred options sites and boundary maps. I fully understand the need to develop a local plane however by including this site the SMDC has ignored. 1) Safety concerns relating to the A520 2) The requirements of the town and country planning regulation's 3) The views of the parish council 4) The views of the people living in Cheddleton. 5) The government policy to protect the green belt land 6) The lack of infrastructure, including schools and medical services 7) The spirit of the location act 2011 To expand. 1) The site is designated in green belt 2) This site doesn't align	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO2482 PO2480 PO2476 PO2474 PO2502 PO2500 PO2488 PO2494 PO2492 PO2486 PO2484 PO2490	Harrison Mr A Cowdy Mr And Mrs RJ/S Morris Ms C Knight-holland Mrs B Knight Mrs J Plimley Ms Dawn Hadley Mr Mark Wheel Mr. Martyn Findlow Ms Emily Wheel Mrs K McCall C Pegg Alexander Harrison						with the National Planning Policy Framework regarding Green Belt. This proposed will effectively join Cheddleton to Wetley Rocks and encroaches onto the countryside. Site CD002 and CD003 provide the only green space between the 2 villages. 3) This site does not meet the sustainability objectives as detailed in the national planning policy framework. 4) No consideration has been given to the accessibility to and from this site by foot or cycle. 5) Site has an infrequent bus service to the other parts of North Staffs 6) The A520 between Ostlers Lane Wetley Rocks has significant History of road accidents. On the data shows that there have been 22 accidents between 2005 and 2013, despite the installation of Cameras inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 7) The pavement on the A520 is narrow (less than 1m) and on 1 side only. Cars travel legally at 50 mph and it is considered that this does not form a safe walking route for those accessing it. Such as schools etc. in the village centre. 8) The junction off Folly Lane and Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 9) The site is 1.6 miles away from the catchment Primary schools. Given the lack of provisions for pedestrians, cycles and the infrequent bus service, the obvious method of accessing the schools and increase the Cheadle Road has an accident history. Inclusion of this site will increase the safety risk at this location. 10) Schools in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in population and are currently full or have a small number of vacant places. This proposed residential development would require significant investment to address this issue. In addition further buses would be required to transport 5 to 13 pupils to Leek as there is no provision in the village. 11) It is considered that the existing utilities in this area could not sustain an increase in demand significant investment. This has not been considered. 12) Site has no substantial access to GP surgery. 13) It is known that the developer has attempted to coerce the Parish Council/SMDC for over approximately 20 years to support the release this site from Green Belt. Every attempt has previously been blocked by the parish council and residents of Cheddleton. This demonstrates the strength of feeling 14) Site has numerous trees that are known habitat wildlife, including a known bat population.	
PO4501	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			CD003	Support	The removal of sites CD002 and CD003 from the Green Belt are supported. [Refer to Question 1 attachments].	Support noted. See responses to Question 37 – housing allocations CD002 and CD003.
PO9556	Mrs Anita M. Williams				CD003	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to proposed removal of CD003 from existing extent of Green Belt: 2015 Green Belt Review explains that CD003 was included within Green Belt to prevent coalescence of Cheddleton/Folly Lane/Wetley Rocks developing site would run contrary to this aim and purpose number (2) of Green Belts (NPPF) believe this Review is wrong in	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							stating parcel C14 makes 'limited contribution' to GB, should be 'significant contribution. In March 2015 Prime Minister declared protecting Green Belt is paramount. SMDC failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs explored (including brownfield sites and vacant properties). Lockwood Hall ecological survey of site refers to trees of bat potential and species rich hedgerow. SMDC have failed to consider this fact. Question why these sites being considered given they are Green Belt. development will form coalescence of Cheddleton/Wetley Rocks. [1970s appeal failed on these very grounds].	
PO3	Mr Peter Blakeman				CD003	Object	Greenbelt areas were created to stop neighbouring towns merging into one another. If the proposed sites CD002 and CD003 are used this removes any discernible boundary between Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton removing the original character of the separate towns. Tree protection orders should also be in place on the tree's and hedging running across the centre of the proposed sites discussed as they house a discernible amount of wildlife. Wildlife includes active bat roosts which have not been investigated or treated in line with Government guidelines so far.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO297	Ms Julie Brownhill				CD003	Object	Removal of Green Belt land on this site would allow the coalescence of Wetley Rocks and Cheddleton. There is evidence of a bat population on the site. Curlew and Lapwing have been seen in the vicinity. Since both these species have 'red list' status it would be detrimental to the recovery of their population to allow development on this site. The removal of green belt status should only happen in 'exceptional circumstances'. The desire to build houses cannot be deemed 'exceptional'.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO320	Mr Greg Bicker				CD003	Object	CD003 according to the council's sustainability report is grade 4ALC green belt, development of which would be negative to the sites ecological importance. I am aware of nocturnal bat activity in the area and can see no evidence that a full bat survey has been carried out, or a full ecological survey of the minor waterway that bisects the CD003 area. Before further action is taken, public availability of detailed ecological reports needs to be provided.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO313	Dr Gordon Wright				CD003	Object	The use of CD003 for housing would cause a great deal of noise and pollution for existing residents, who have long understood that this land would continue to be part of the green belt.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.
PO584 PO932	Mrs Susan Buxton Mr John Buxton				CD003	Object	I most strongly object to amending the Green Belt at site CD003 which has previously been assessed as having a negative effect. This site has had planning permission refused in the past because of its importance as part of the Green Belt and the fact that it goes against at least 2 major principles of the Green Belt Policy. Including this site in the Local Plan would, in effect, join the two communities of Cheddleton and Wetley Rocks constituting a major coalescent. As an alternative, I would strongly support the recent application by John Pointon and Sons	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003. An application for residential development has been approved by planning committee (subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement) for the Staffordshire Farmers site (Jan 2017).

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							to vary the planning obligation of June 2010 and would urge the Council to allow the development of an already brownfield site, at what is known locally as Staffordshire Farmers, which would significantly contribute to the number of houses required by SMDC without amending the Green Belt and be more central to the village itself.	
PO2310	Ms C Knight-holland				CD003	Object	I consider the removal; of site CD003 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD003 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote "to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks" The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD003 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMDC has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD003 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The Lockwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance". SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD003 as a potential site allocation for housing I consider the removal; of site CD003 from the existing green belt is wrong and I strongly object to the proposal. The national Planning Policy framework (NPPF) clearly states that the green belt serves a purposes: 1 to check the unrestricted sprawl of large areas. 2 to	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation CD003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4 to preserve the setting and special character of historic town 4 to assist in the Urban regeneration, by recycling and derelict and other urban As page 14 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review states the site CD003 was included within the existing North Staffs Green Belt to, I quote “to prevent the coalescence of the following towns and settlements around the potteries. This list includes, Cheddleton with Folly Lane and Folly Lane with Wetley Rocks” The term towns in the NPPF should I believe in this case be considered as towns and settlements, as per the original designation. By removing this is site from the greenbelt and allowing the building of houses this fundamentally undermines this original aim of designation and will indirect conflict with point 2 above. I consider page 40 of the Amec Foster Wheeler Green Belt review has wrongly stated that site C14 makes a limited contribution to preventing towns to towns merging where as it should state significant contribution in March 2015 the prime minister declared that protecting the green belt is paramount I consider that removing CD003 from the green belt undermines the objectives. The NPPF makes clear that once established green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances SMD C has failed to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist and all other options to meet housing needs in North Staffs have been exploring utilising the significant number of existing vacant properties in the area. Site CD003 is a known habitat for wildlife and has a known bat population. The Lockwood Hall associates reports in its concluding remarks for site FIC 180 stated I quote, however the major aspects of interest are the significant bat potential in the 5 trees and the species rich hedgerow which constitutes the site being given district importance”. SDMC has failed to consider this fact when the allocation of CD003 as a potential site allocation for housing	
Endon								
PO263	mr anthony williamson				EN012	Object	I strongly object to all the Green Belt amendments as the Green Belt should always be protected for future generations.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN012.
PO981 PO984 PO992	Mrs Hayley Sullivan Mr Michael Sullivan Mr Oliver Sullivan				EN012	Object	Green Belt Amendments Comments in relation to Green Belt and Development Boundary and Green Belt Review 2015: Government Policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outline the need to protect Green Belt areas. The NPPF specifies that the Green Belt is of great importance in order to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The NPPF is clear that “once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”. The adopted Core Strategy committed the District Council to	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN012.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							undertake a review of the Green Belt for the whole District in order to determine the scope for development sites to help meet requirements. The review considered the scope to release land from the Green Belt by appraising sites against the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. The study concluded that generally the extent of the Green Belt should be retained. However, several areas were identified as suitable for release from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances through a Local Plan review as required by the NPPF. In making a decision that 'exceptional circumstances' apply, it is essential that all other routes to meeting the housing targets are fully exhausted therefore safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preventing unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. Site EN012 is not only categorised as 'Green Belt' but is clearly used in such a manner as it is currently used for cattle grazing over the summer months. Endon is already identified as a 'larger Village' and should be protected from further development which extends beyond the current development boundary. In addition, there are other sites in the Endon and surrounding area not deemed to be Green Belt which should be developed before encroaching on the Green Belt. The approach should be to build in infill / windfall sites in brownfield areas, built in a manner which supports the current village footprint and which does not create even larger housing estates. In addition, the Council's plans refer to strictly controlling development outside of the development boundary. Site EN012 is outside of the development boundary.	
PO6	Mr Alan Dale				EN033	Object	Taken from the 'Planning Practice Guidance'. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Of the 5 purposes served by Green Belt, the proposed change at EN033 and EN126 is in clear contravention of " to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment". Chapter 83 goes on to say " Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". Until now, due to the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, it has been protected under such an agreement. Thus, while alternative land remains available, the proposal to infill areas EN033 and EN126 should be revoked. Furthermore, as area EN126 especially is prone to flooding, it makes little sense to build new housing on what is saturated ground.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.
PO10	Mr Alan Dale				EN033	Object	Taken from the Planning Practice Guidance " The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							their openness and their permanence". Of the 5 purposes served by Green Belt, this proposal is in clear contravention of " to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment" and serves to undermine the Government's very own ethos. Para 83 goes on to say " Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". Endon village has until now been protected by a Green Belt because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, while many alternatives sites remain available, this proposal should be revoked.	
PO317	Mr Robert G McCraight				EN033	Object	This Green Belt brings the countryside to Endon. If you fill this with houses and concrete, the whole feeling of Endon being a village will disappear, as the canal will be like a barrier. Keep the building sites compact and don't spread them out like wings.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.
PO447	Mrs Patricia Bailey				EN033	Object	The proposed sites EN033 and EN126 are located directly adjacent to, and directly overlying along the south-west boundary, a 'medium' flood risk area and a 'Flood Zone 3' floodplain as designated by the Environment Agency. Experience living in the area has shown that the land directly to the west of the proposed sites has flooded a number of times in the last 30 years due to overtopping of the unnamed culvert to the west of Post Lane. Where the unnamed culvert passes beneath Post Lane in an enclosed section, the road has been rendered unpassable during previous flood events due to the height of rising flood waters when the flow capacity of the enclosed culvert has been exceeded. The loss of green belt land across the EN033 and EN126 sites would result in the loss of a large area of vegetated arable land with a high potential for rain water infiltration and storage. Combined with the construction of a significant area of new hardstanding, the volume of surface runoff water entering the culvert to the west of Post Lane is anticipated to greatly increase. Additionally, owing to the reduction in the current level of rain water storage and infiltration potential, the runoff duration of surface water entering the culvert would reduce. The cumulative effect of these actions has the potential to significantly increase the likelihood, frequency and magnitude of flood events in the Post Lane area. The associated increase in short-term construction and long-term operation traffic related to the proposed EN033 and EN126 sites would increase traffic levels in an area which is already prone to high levels of traffic congestion. The canal crossing to the south east of the proposed sites is a traffic-light controlled single lane bridge which can become congested at peak times. Traffic flow and congestion around this area would surely increase with the construction a number of new dwellings reducing the quality of life for the existing residents, canal users and visitors. Taking into consideration the close proximity of the sites to a designated floodplain and the history of	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							flooding over the roads in the Post Lane area, any plans to develop this area further should be subject to particular scrutiny. We consider it imperative that the proposed developers are questioned as to how they will ensure that the inevitable increase to the volume of drainage water directed to surface water drains will not exacerbate the current road flooding issues. In particular the proposed developers should address how the existing drainage bottleneck where the unnamed culvert passes below Post Lane shall not be exacerbated by the proposed development and associated increase in drainage water volume, whereby existing roads and properties will be put under increased risk of flooding. We would request that a full Environmental Scoping Report and Environmental Impact Assessment (incorporating a detailed flood risk assessment) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted to confirm the anticipated effects on flood risk and traffic levels are acceptable. [Refer to attached response form, and its attachments].	
PO904	MRS SUSAN WILSON				EN033	Object	EN 033 and EN126. I oppose any incursion into greenbelt land on the grounds that I understand that there is enough brownfield sites available in the area to satisfy any housing requirements thus protecting our precious greenbelt	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.
PO9592 PO9564	Mrs P Bailey Mr Richard Bailey				EN033	Object	Response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site EN033: EN033/EN126 are located directly adjacent to medium flood risk area and Flood Zone 3. Land directly west has flooded in the past due to overtopping of a nearby culvert. Road has been unpassable during previous flood events. The loss of these Green Belt sites would result in loss of large area for rain water infiltration and storage. Along with new development hardstanding, surface water run off into culvert would increase. Surface water run off duration into culvert would reduce. Would increase risk of flood events. Construction and operational traffic associated with these sites would increase traffic levels in already congested area. Traffic lights hump bridge gets congested at peak times. Increased traffic would reduce quality of life. Given these flood risks, plans should be subject to particular scrutiny. Developers must ensure increase in drainage water will not exacerbate current road flooding issues. Request full scoping report + EIA (incorporating detailed FRA) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN033.
PO1062	Mr Stuart Davies				EN126	Object	The proposed development site, EN126 adjoins the Caldon Canal, which is a historic and attractive feature well used by boaters, walkers and cyclists. There are other sites in Endon along the A53 Leek Road, which would be preferable to be developed. These sites are also green belt and part of a conservation area, however they do provide better sites than EN126 and EN033. If any development does proceed on EN126 then it should be low key, away from the canal and in keeping with the surroundings. Street	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN126.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
PO449	Mrs Patricia Bailey				EN126	Object	lighting should therefore not be permitted. The proposed sites EN033 and EN126 are located directly adjacent to, and directly overlying along the south-west boundary, a 'medium' flood risk area and a 'Flood Zone 3' floodplain as designated by the Environment Agency. Experience living in the area has shown that the land directly to the west of the proposed sites has flooded a number of times in the last 30 years due to overtopping of the unnamed culvert to the west of Post Lane. Where the unnamed culvert passes beneath Post Lane in an enclosed section, the road has been rendered unpassable during previous flood events due to the height of rising flood waters when the flow capacity of the enclosed culvert has been exceeded. The loss of green belt land across the EN033 and EN126 sites would result in the loss of a large area of vegetated arable land with a high potential for rain water infiltration and storage. Combined with the construction of a significant area of new hardstanding, the volume of surface runoff water entering the culvert to the west of Post Lane is anticipated to greatly increase. Additionally, owing to the reduction in the current level of rain water storage and infiltration potential, the runoff duration of surface water entering the culvert would reduce. The cumulative effect of these actions has the potential to significantly increase the likelihood, frequency and magnitude of flood events in the Post Lane area. The associated increase in short-term construction and long-term operation traffic related to the proposed EN033 and EN126 sites would increase traffic levels in an area which is already prone to high levels of traffic congestion. The canal crossing to the south east of the proposed sites is a traffic-light controlled single lane bridge which can become congested at peak times. Traffic flow and congestion around this area would surely increase with the construction a number of new dwellings reducing the quality of life for the existing residents, canal users and visitors. Taking into consideration the close proximity of the sites to a designated floodplain and the history of flooding over the roads in the Post Lane area, any plans to develop this area further should be subject to particular scrutiny. We consider it imperative that the proposed developers are questioned as to how they will ensure that the inevitable increase to the volume of drainage water directed to surface water drains will not exacerbate the current road flooding issues. In particular the proposed developers should address how the existing drainage bottleneck where the unnamed culvert passes below Post Lane shall not be exacerbated by the proposed development and associated increase in drainage water volume, whereby existing roads and properties will be put under increased risk of flooding. We would request that a full Environmental Scoping Report and Environmental Impact Assessment (incorporating a	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation EN126.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							detailed flood risk assessment) is undertaken prior to any approvals being granted to confirm the anticipated effects on flood risk and traffic levels are acceptable.	
Kingsley								
PO829	Ms Alison Conybeare				KG049A	Object	The greenbelt must not be altered for development.	Comments noted.
PO489	Mr Arthur Brown				KG049A	Object	I think the proposed site is not suitable for development for the following reasons: The land would need to be accessed from either Moreton Avenue or Cheadle road. Neither of these roads are suitable for increased traffic and will certainly not stand up to construction traffic. Local residents will suffer as a result. There is currently insufficient infrastructure within the village and this will only add to traffic and people commuting, causing more pollution, noise and danger to existing residents. The site extends the boundary of the village and will result in loss of farmland which is frequented by many mammals, amphibians and birds, which will be either displaced or destroyed. The development would ruin the outlook for local residents adjoining the site and those overlooking it. Although I believe the village cannot accommodate the extra houses, should this be unavoidable, a more suitable site was initially proposed within the village which would cause less distribution and less sprawl. There are other developments locally which should be taken into account to reduce the allocation. Several houses are already for sale in the village and have been for some time.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation KG049A.
Northern Gateway Opportunity Site								
PO1033	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Northern Gateway Opportunity Site	Object	All of this is in Green Belt.	The site is not located within the Green Belt.
PO9944	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Northern Gateway Opportunity Site	Support	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: site that comprises part of the allocated site known as Blythe Vale, is not within the designated Green Belt of Staffordshire Moorlands, and neither does the development of this site require the further release of Green Belt land. The Local Plan (1998) replaced the North Staffordshire Green Belt Local Plan and made amendments to the inner boundaries of the Green Belt around Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, associated with the construction of the A50 which created enclosed land which could be readily parcelled for development. These amendments left what the SMDC Green Belt Review (2015) terms as a 'rather incongruous boundary' with land between the St Modwen land and the land that comprises the remainder of the RIS, south of the A50. We support the suggested realignment of the inner Green Belt Boundary in the Preferred Options, and consider it	Support noted. See also responses to Question 37 – regarding housing allocations in Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook and Question 39 – regarding the Northern Gateway Opportunity Site.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							appropriate that the Site, which has been identified for development in excess of 20 years, is brought firmly within the settlement boundary of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. The Green Belt Review assessed 6 out of 10 suggested sites as having potential to be released from the Green Belt at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. It concludes for these sites 'release under exceptional circumstances, plus amendment of the village boundary to accommodate proposed development.' We are not aware of the Local Plan or Evidence Base presenting any exceptional circumstances that would justify the need for Green Belt release at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, or that have been used to support the identification of two potential housing sites (BB041 and BB054) for a total of 120 new homes. It is our view that in seeking to accommodate the housing requirement (or any additional requirement) afforded to Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, that the Local Plan and its evidence base should have considered the opportunity of locating residential development at Blythe Vale, as opposed to remaining silent on it. [Notwithstanding that both BB041 and BB054 are assessed as 'well enclosed,' this is far from being an 'exceptional' circumstance, etc.] the principle of development at Blythe Vale has been established firmly through the continued allocation of the site for employment use and the Outline Planning Permission (11/00405). Its development in part for housing would not require the alteration of the Green Belt boundary. Indeed the potential to accommodate housing on this site is further evidence to suggest that exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify removing BB054 or BB041 from the Green Belt.	
Stockton Brook								
PO920	Mr Nick Mountford	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd		Object	Object to the omission of Site ADD08 from the proposed residential sites. The reason for this objection are contained in the response to Question 34.	See response to Question 34 – suggested site ADD08.
Werrington								
PO106	Mr Nigel Meakin				WE003	Object	Letter with response form submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options site WE003: The preferred development site carries several objections to it. Development too close to young offenders buildings Green belt Outside of village existing development boundary SCC Highway rejected original proposal along with Werrington parish council Residents views from existing dwellings Open space rural and natural beauty There are other sites available in the village to develop as chosen by the residents of the village.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO1236	Mrs T Wiggins				WE003	Object	The 2015 Green Belt review was selective by concentrating only on existing housing sites proposed by the District Council e.g.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							ignoring potential sites including land in south Ash Bank Road. Why is it that land already earmarked as appropriate for build can be moved to an area that already holds existing issues as outlined in Q37 that have not been fully looked at before. WE003 represents a substantial encroachment into the Green Belt	
PO845	Mr Peter Davies				WE003	Object	Although I am responding on WE003 my comments are for the Green Belt in all areas. As stated in Government policy the Green Belt should be preserved unless there are exceptional circumstances. Having the Green Belt protects the village amenity of these areas and to infill these areas with more housing destroys the rural feel of these villages. They just become part of the wider urban sprawl. There are vast brownfield sites around Stoke on Trent which are real eyesores and would benefit from redevelopment.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO1031	Mr Grant Anderson	Fradley Estates	Mr Grant Anderson		WE003	Object	PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION 4 : LARGER VILLAGES Question 36 We act for Fradley Estates, the owner of land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, Werrington (“the Site”) which is put forward for housing development in this Plan. Fradley Estates objects to the Green Belt amendments for Werrington (WE003,WE013,WE027,WE052,WE069)and submits that the Green Belt boundary should be amended to include the Site. Site Information Site location: Land off Tregaron Court and Langton Court, Werrington – see plan attached. Site Area (ha) About 4.45 ha (including the woodland belts to the north west boundary). Current & most recent land use Agriculture (relatively low value grazing/hay production). Description of site Greenfield Site features The south east boundary of the Site is formed by the rear boundary fences of houses in Tregaron Court, Weston Close, Ferndale Close and Langton Court. The north west boundary is a natural and defensible boundary formed by a stream course. Further east, this stream course forms part of the Green Belt boundary. The south west boundary is formed by mature woodland vegetation comprising a substantial hedgerow and hedgerow trees with associated bridleway. The bridleway lies outside the site. Again, a strong defensible boundary. The north east boundary is represented in part by the stream course referred to above but in the main by the rear of dwellings fronting Uplands Croft. The Site is well contained visually by the hedgerow and hedgerow trees to the bridleway and by a substantial belt of woodland trees near the stream course. The Site is greenfield in character but has not been put to intensive agricultural use, merely used for grazing or for a hay crop. The Site is assessed as being of relatively low ecological value. Available means of access into the Site Appropriate access to the Site is available from Tregaron Court and/or Langton Court. Land at the end of both these cul-de-sacs is retained by Fradley Estates following the construction of the adjacent housing estate and these roads were	Comments noted. See responses to Question 37 – Werrington housing allocations.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							designed to accommodate future housing development beyond. The Site plan which is submitted by separate email demonstrates the extent of the freehold ownership of Fradley Estates. Short term licences have been granted to adjacent householders to temporarily use the land at both points of access so that the land remains available for access purposes for housing development. A highway report by Sanderson Associates was submitted to the Council in December 2015 which concludes that access can be provided to serve the development of the Site which meets all current highway guidwlinwes. Availability of utilities and services All necessary utilities including potable water, foul and surface water drainage, gas, electricity, telecoms etc are available at the periphery of the Site and can be easily extended into the Site to facilitate development. Drainage connections are already available on-site. Public Right of Way/ Peripheral Planting The public right of way (outside the Site) which follows the south west boundary of the Site with hedgerows and hedgerow trees is located on the periphery of the Site and with vehicular access available elsewhere, neither the public right of way nor associated hedgerows and hedgerow trees will constrain the layout or development of the Site. Indeed, it is proposed that both features will be retained/enhanced and incorporated into the development of the Site – see the Concept Layout appended to the Bright & Associates landscape Evidence Report 2015. Constraints The Site is not at risk of flooding; there is no known land contamination; foul and surface water drainage etc is available; the Site is assessed as being of low ecological value; there is no known archaeological or heritage constraint and therefore there are no major impediments to the early development of this Site. Availability The Site and its points of access are wholly owned by Fradley Estates a development company which is of long standing and skilled in bringing forward land for housing development. Fradley Estates has been responsible for building a significant proportion of the existing housing in Werrington and is therefore very familiar with the locality and has a proven track record of delivery. Fradley Estates is willing and able to bring the Site forward for housing in the short term with a projected yield beginning within 5 years. Supporting comments Although the Site is located within the Green Belt, visually, it is well contained by the natural features that are the stream course and in particular by the well established tree belts and hedgerows on the Site periphery and outer boundary. The north east boundary of the Site is formed in part by existing housing development and in part the stream course which forms the outer boundary of the Site. A precedent has therefore been set for the use of this stream course as a defensible green belt boundary. A Landscape Evidence Report by Bright & Associates was submitted to the Council on behalf of	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							Fradley Estates in December 2015 ("LER"). In the context of the need to find housing in a sustainable larger village such as Werrington, it is inevitable that Green Belt land will be required. THE LER concluded that in landscape and visual terms the Site is visually well contained and that in terms of the Green Belt, allocation of the Site would be less damaging to the Green Belt than many of the sites considered by the Council including the preferred options. Fradley Estates and its advisers met with Mark James and Pranali Parikh in April 2016 to discuss the Site. It was agreed at that meeting that the Site had been incorrectly classified in the SHLAA as a category C site due to the Council's misunderstanding of the access position and the incorrect assumption that access was not available. It was accepted that the Site should have been classified as category B in which case it would have been the subject of a more detailed review together with other potential sites for Werrington. It was agreed that the Site had "some catching up to do" and that Fradley Estates would submit further information in support of the Site addressing the Council's strategic Green Belt review, the Council's review of the historic landscape and the sustainability of the Site. A further report has been prepared by Bright & Associates which considers the Site and other potential sites in Werrington including the preferred options in terms of landscape and visual impact and Green Belt, which addresses any effects on the historic landscape and which assesses the sustainability of the Site. A copy of that report which also appends the earlier LER and Sanderson Associates highway report is submitted with these representations by way of separate email. It is clear from the June 2016 Bright & Associates report that:- the development of the Site will have no adverse effects on the historic landscape. the Site is more visually contained than the preferred sites for Werrington and that the allocation of the Site will improve the current sharp edge between housing and field space along the southern boundary of the Site. the Site has advantages over other sites in terms of not compromising the openness of the countryside and in visual terms it does not form part of the Green Belt. the development of the Site would meet the three dimensions of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also clear from the above, that the Site has no technical constraints which would affect its delivery - indeed as stated above, the Site is owned by a developer with a proven track record of delivery in Werrington who is keen to bring the Site forward. The same cannot be said of other potential sites in Werrington (including the preferred options). Furthermore, it is considered that rather than allocate a number of relatively small capacity sites in Werrington as in the case of the preferred options, the allocation of a relatively large site is	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
							preferable. The reasons for this include:- The Site is likely to have less impact in landscape and visual impact terms and less perceived impact on the Green Belt than sites currently under consideration. A larger site in the hands of a developer is more likely to deliver and, thereby, deliver a substantial element of the housing requirement for Werrington. A larger site such as the Site is more able to deliver affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions. On the other hand, some of the smaller sites will not be able to carry affordable housing requirements and other infrastructure contributions and so a relatively large site such as the Site is preferable in delivering overall on Development Plan objectives for sustainability. Fradley Estates also owns an area of land off Hillside Road, Werrington which could be brought forward in conjunction with the development of the Site for the delivery of open space and /or low cost housing. It is also submitted that the location and characteristics of the Site mean that a development of the Site would from a qualitative and marketing perspective be better than the Council's preferred options which locate development around the HMYO institution. Fradley Estates therefore objects to the Green Belt amendments for Werrington (WE003,WE013,WE027,WE052,WE069)and submits that the Green Belt boundary should be amended to include the Site.	
PO9601 PO9596 PO9599	Mr Nigel Meakin Mrs A Meakin Mr J Meakin				WE003	Object	Letter with response form submitted [see comment PO106 attachment] objecting to Green Belt amendment associated with WE003:	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO9521 PO9524 PO9601 PO9596 PO9599	Miss B Jack Mr Nicholas Harding Mr Nigel Meakin Mrs A Meakin Mr J Meakin				WE003	Object	The 2015 Green Belt Review was selective by concentrating only on existing housing sites proposed by the District Council ignoring potential sites including land in south Ash Bank Road. Why is it that land already earmarked as appropriate for building can be moved to an area that already has existing issues and has not been fully looked at before. WE003 represents a substantial encroachment into the Green Belt.	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO2072	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			WE003	Object	Object - Proximity to YO1, a significant encroachment into Green Belt and as identified by SCC presents traffic problems. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO2099	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			WE052	Object	Object - would not maintain line of buildings encroaches into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Comments noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE003.
PO2078	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			WE013	Support	Support - generally maintains line of buildings and not substantial encroachment into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations WE013.
PO2088	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish			WE069	Support	Support - generally maintains line of buildings and not substantial encroachment into Green Belt. (extract only - please read full	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocations WE069.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/ Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Site reference Green Belt	Support object general comment	Consultee comments	Officer comments
		Council					response submitted).	
PO2083	Mr Andy Boys	Werrington Parish Council			WE027	Support	Support and it is understood that the owner of site WE068 (SHLAA 2015) would release for development. (extract only - please read full response submitted).	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE027 and suggested site WE068.
PO247	Mr Simon Freisner	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	WE013	Support	See comments on housing allocations.	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE069.
PO248	Mr Steve Whiston	Director Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	WE069	Support	Please see comments on the housing allocations.	Support noted. See response to Question 37 – housing allocation WE069.

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
PO423	Mr Howard Leeson		Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	General comment	What is not clear is what are the specific allocations (both local needs and affordable dwellings) for the smaller villages and how affordable housing needs are to be met in the rural parishes.	- The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with the criteria based policy in the Local Plan - Policies in the Local Plan will require an element of new housing provision to be affordable
PO1037	Mr Grant Anderson	Fradley Estates	Mr Grant Anderson		Object	PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES AND BOUNDARIES CONSULTATION 4 : LARGER VILLAGES Question 37 We act for Fradley Estates, the owner of land off Tregaron Court/Langton Court, Werrington ("the Site") which is put forward for housing development in this Plan. Fradley Estates objects to the preferred options/proposed allocations for Werrington (WE003,WE013,WE027,WE052,WE069) and submits that the Site should be allocated for housing. Site Information Site location: Land off Tregaron Court and Langton Court, Werrington – see plan attached. Site Area (ha) About 4.45 ha (including the woodland belts to the north west boundary). Current & most recent land use Agriculture (relatively low value grazing/hay production). Description of site Greenfield Site features The south east boundary of the Site is formed by the rear boundary fences of houses in Tregaron Court, Weston Close, Ferndale Close and	- The site suggested was assessed as a C site in the SHLAA and was not considered suitable for development. It was considered there was no suitable access to the site and the site was identified in the L & SCA as forming important landscape setting. It is understood access to the site maybe able to be achieved from Tregaron Court. - The site suggested is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						Langton Court. The north west boundary is a natural and defensible boundary formed by a stream course. Further east, this stream course forms part of the Green Belt boundary. The south west boundary is formed by mature woodland vegetation comprising a substantial hedgerow and hedgerow trees with associated bridleway. The bridleway lies outside the site. Again, a strong defensible boundary. The north east boundary is represented in part by the stream course referred to above but in the main by the rear of dwellings fronting Uplands Croft. The Site is well contained visually by the hedgerow and hedgerow trees to the bridleway and by a substantial belt of woodland trees near the stream course. The Site is greenfield in character but has not been put to intensive agricultural use, merely used for grazing or for a hay crop. The Site is assessed as being of relatively low ecological value. Available means of access into the Site Appropriate access to the Site is available from Tregaron Court and/or Langton Court. Land at the end of both these cul-de-sacs is retained by Fradley Estates following the construction of the adjacent housing estate and these roads were designed to accommodate future housing development beyond. The Site plan which is submitted by separate email demonstrates the extent of the freehold ownership of Fradley Estates. Short term licences have been granted to adjacent householders to temporarily use the land at both points of access so that the land remains available for access purposes for housing development. A highway report by Sanderson Associates was submitted to the Council in December 2015 which concludes that access can be provided to serve the development of the Site which meets all current highway guidelinwes. Availability of utilities and services All necessary utilities including potable water, foul and surface water drainage, gas, electricity, telecoms etc are available at the periphery of the Site and can be easily extended into the Site to facilitate development. Drainage connections are already available on-site. Public Right of Way/ Peripheral Planting The public right of way (outside the Site) which follows the south west boundary of the Site with hedgerows and hedgerow trees is located on the periphery of the Site and with vehicular access available elsewhere, neither the public right of way	boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. The Green Belt Additional Site Appraisals 2016 found that the site could be considered for release from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						nor associated hedgerows and hedgerow trees will constrain the layout or development of the Site. Indeed, it is proposed that both features will be retained/enhanced and incorporated into the development of the Site – see the Concept Layout appended to the Bright & Associates landscape Evidence Report 2015. Constraints The Site is not at risk of flooding; there is no known land contamination; foul and surface water drainage etc is available; the Site is assessed as being of low ecological value; there is no known archaeological or heritage constraint and therefore there are no major impediments to the early development of this Site. Availability The Site and its points of access are wholly owned by Fradley Estates a development company which is of long standing and skilled in bringing forward land for housing development. Fradley Estates has been responsible for building a significant proportion of the existing housing in Werrington and is therefore very familiar with the locality and has a proven track record of delivery. Fradley Estates is willing and able to bring the Site forward for housing in the short term with a projected yield beginning within 5 years. Supporting comments Although the Site is located within the Green Belt, visually, it is well contained by the natural features that are the stream course and in particular by the well established tree belts and hedgerows on the Site periphery and outer boundary. The north east boundary of the Site is formed in part by existing housing development and in part the stream course which forms the outer boundary of the Site. A precedent has therefore been set for the use of this stream course as a defensible green belt boundary. A Landscape Evidence Report by Bright & Associates was submitted to the Council on behalf of Fradley Estates in December 2015 (“LER”). In the context of the need to find housing in a sustainable larger village such as Werrington, it is inevitable that Green Belt land will be required. THE LER concluded that in landscape and visual terms the Site is visually well contained and that in terms of the Green Belt, allocation of the Site would be less damaging to the Green Belt than many of the sites considered by the Council including the preferred options. Fradley Estates and its advisers met with Mark James and Pranali Parikh in April 2016 to discuss the Site. It was	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						agreed at that meeting that the Site had been incorrectly classified in the SHLAA as a category C site due to the Council's misunderstanding of the access position and the incorrect assumption that access was not available. It was accepted that the Site should have been classified as category B in which case it would have been the subject of a more detailed review together with other potential sites for Werrington. It was agreed that the Site had "some catching up to do" and that Fradley Estates would submit further information in support of the Site addressing the Council's strategic Green Belt review, the Council's review of the historic landscape and the sustainability of the Site. A further report has been prepared by Bright & Associates which considers the Site and other potential sites in Werrington including the preferred options in terms of landscape and visual impact and Green Belt, which addresses any effects on the historic landscape and which assesses the sustainability of the Site. A copy of that report which also appends the earlier LER and Sanderson Associates highway report is submitted with these representations by way of separate email. It is clear from the June 2016 Bright & Associates report that:- the development of the Site will have no adverse effects on the historic landscape. the Site is more visually contained than the preferred sites for Werrington and that the allocation of the Site will improve the current sharp edge between housing and field space along the southern boundary of the Site. the Site has advantages over other sites in terms of not compromising the openness of the countryside and in visual terms it does not form part of the Green Belt. the development of the Site would meet the three dimensions of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also clear from the above, that the Site has no technical constraints which would affect its delivery - indeed as stated above, the Site is owned by a developer with a proven track record of delivery in Werrington who is keen to bring the Site forward. The same cannot be said of other potential sites in Werrington (including the preferred options). Furthermore, it is considered that rather than allocate a number of relatively small capacity sites in Werrington as in the case of the preferred options, the allocation of a relatively large site is	

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						preferable. The reasons for this include:- The Site is likely to have less impact in landscape and visual impact terms and less perceived impact on the Green Belt than sites currently under consideration. A larger site in the hands of a developer is more likely to deliver and, thereby, deliver a substantial element of the housing requirement for Werrington. A larger site such as the Site is more able to deliver affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions. On the other hand, some of the smaller sites will not be able to carry affordable housing requirements and other infrastructure contributions and so a relatively large site such as the Site is preferable in delivering overall on Development Plan objectives for sustainability. Fradley Estates also owns an area of land off Hillside Road, Werrington which could be brought forward in conjunction with the development of the Site for the delivery of open space and /or low cost housing. It is also submitted that the location and characteristics of the Site mean that a development of the Site would from a qualitative and marketing perspective be better than the Council's preferred options which locate development around the HMYO institution. Fradley Estates therefore objects to the preferred options/proposed allocations for Werrington (WE003,WE013,WE027,WE052,WE069) and submits that the Site should be allocated for housing.	
PO127	Mr Steve Wood				General comment	There is a better layout and an available brownfield plot to complement the usage of CD017, before we build on greenfield sites. Currently there is a large opposition to the proposed houses in CD002 and CD003, mainly because of the dangerous access onto the main road via Rock end drive and the merging of the villages. To date there isn't really any opposition to CD017 and 35- 38 additional houses could be accommodated here. I own a brownfield plot of land that runs alongside the proposed plot of CD017 and CD019, which would significantly increase the size of the land available and afford more houses to be built in this area. The access to CD017 is on a straight piece of road and it is even wide enough for mini round about if needed. When we had the call for sites I submitted our plot for review and this was noted and given a number. The only real objection to this was the green belt. All these proposed plots of CD002,	The site suggested is in the Green Belt and not well related to the built up area. The NPPF states that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In order to release a site from the Green Belt the Council must be able to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist. Consideration needs to be given to all the relevant evidence to

Q37 Do you have any comments on the housing allocations for the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company/Organisation	Agent Name	Company / Organisation	Support/object/general comment	Comments	Officer Response
						CD003 and CD017 are in green belt land. Reasons why our land would make a better alternative/ complementary site are mainly that it was incorrectly labelled as green belt, rather than being inside the green belt. In reality most of it has old stables and a menage on it, meaning it is actually classed as brownfield land. Such equestrian developments fall within the definition of previously developed land as set out in the national planning policy framework, and thus the development of this site is supported by the provisions of policy SD1, principle 8, which seeks to encourage the reuse of previously developed (brownfield) sites. When we first moved here three of our borders backed against open fields. Since then the sports park has been built against one and CD017 is being proposed against another. You will not be able to see this land from the road. All in all I do not think you should develop green belt land before brownfield land. Brownfield land is rare across the Cheddleton area and I have some that has been dismissed. This does not make sense to me. If anyone from the council planning department want to come and have a look at this in person, I will be more than happy to accommodate them.	determine the overall suitability of the site for release from the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered there are no exceptional circumstances.

Question 38 Do you have any comments on the employment site for the Rural Areas?

ID	Full Name	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General	rural emp comments - Please explain your views	Officer response
PO832	Ms Alison Conybeare			General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Comments noted.
PO2709	Mr Martin Ross		Environment Agency	General comment	Due to the size of the site, it will be possible to design the layout around the floodplain. However, the Ordinary Watercourse running into the River Blithe along the northern edge, will need to be remodeled at the application stage.	Comments noted. The Council sought the views of the Environment Agency in its role as statutory consultee for planning application SMD/2014/0576. The Planning Officer's committee report considers that the scheme is acceptable in flood risk terms subject to the subsequent consent imposing conditions requiring that the scheme be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA; that on-site SuDS be integrated; and other requirements.
PO204	Mrs Jacqueline Leach			Object	OC055 should never have been passed or put on the site allocations plan. Went against Government Inspectors recommendations when he looked at the draft Core Strategy. He declared it unsound. It was removed from the adopted Core Strategy. Councillor Worthington dismissed this at the planning application meeting SMD/204/0576 declaring that it should never have been taken out. Councillor Davies read from the DRAFT Core Strategy and it was passed as a mixed development with 168 houses. There is a police investigation going ahead and my complaint against councillors Worthington and Davies is with the Government Ombudsman awaiting resolution. Meanwhile the standards committee have declared that Worthington breached the code of conduct on the Endon Ridaing school application and the application was reversed. Why hasn't a breach of the the code of conduct been declared regarding this application and having it overturned?	The reasons for the approval of the mixed industrial/housing application SMD/2014/0576 are set out in the associated Planning Applications Committee report/minutes, along with the responses of statutory consultees to the application, such as SCC Highways. Consequently there is no longer a requirement to take forward the industrial component of this site in to the emerging Local Plan.
PO465	Mr Louie Horleston			Object	The OC055 (Cresswell) site of 8.58 hectares was asked to be removed by the government inspector Patrick Whitehead for the updated core strategy, he stated it has no consideration of the impact it would have on the residents of Cresswell Hamlet, nor has it considered the contamination and flood risks. there is also no mention of the 168 houses that are not in the site allocation to comment on but will have to be considered as they will increase the impact of the expansion of the industrial estate as they have been passed together in the same application. the fact the SMDC have purposely presented the site allocation plan draft in such a way that the public can not comment on the houses with the expansion of the industrial estate is shocking and appalling behaviour for a responsible council to act in this way, I would ask that the following questions be responded to Why would a responsible council issue a decision notice knowing full well that there is a police investigation going on with Cresswell contributing a major part to that police investigation, the cost of putting the hamlet back to its original state would be a considerable burden on the tax payers' pockets and then there is the consideration of the council being sued by the developer for its original decision to pass the development after the developer has spent the money to develop the project and this developer has already been successful in doing this to east borough council. With 3 parish councils objecting to this development representative of approximately 7,000 residents why would a council allow this decision and not return it to the planning committee considering the above points. With a little over a 100 houses in the hamlet to then put another 168 into the rural landscape with no infrastructure begs belief, the fact that it is flood plain and some of the development will be in flood plain 3b is just plain stupid and irresponsible, there is also documented buried contamination from the old colour works that could track straight into the blythe and kill everything down its course into Blithfeild reservoir, why would a council risk this and	See response to PO 204 above.

					subject the public to these risks. This takes away the housing allocation from the towns where there is supposed to be substantial housing for the people who deserve to be accommodated. The expansion of the industrial estate apart from the government inspector telling the council that they should not expand it and remove it from the core strategy was totally ignored and knowing that a false document was used to pass the development was appalling behaviour for a committee to conceive and a responsible council to accept and not return it to the committee. In round figures there is nearly 10 hectares of rural development which is development in rural countryside SMDC have allocated 8.58 hectares of it in the hamlet of Cresswell how is that fair to the other rural communities to have their allocation given to one developer in Cresswell, shocking behaviour. The site allocations document that you have all seen does not even have the houses on it the councils response is below Council has told residents in relation to new housing and repeated the statement as in an email from Mr Gavin Clark responding to an email from VVSM that – The Core Strategy does not identify Cresswell as a village for housing development and therefore we will not be looking to identify housing sites in the Cresswell area. This has been repeated by various council officers over the last few weeks and after the decision notice was issued. A further meeting held between the Council planning department and two Draycott parish councillors a while ago demonstrated that in order to reach housing needs they would need to build 25 houses in Draycott. The proposed development in this application is therefore far too large for Cresswell as a hamlet. You have to consider the points above and have to ask what on earth are SMDC doing ? and they should be held totally responsible for their actions with regard to the Cresswell application and other developments passed that are under investigation by the police.	
PO943	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw			Object	Totally unnecessary in my opinion. Should never have been granted planning permission for expansion. More units mean more traffic of the heavy goods type. This is a village - no shop, no post office, no infrastructure but lots of goods vehicles bad mix.	The reasons for the approval of the mixed industrial/housing application SMD/2014/0576 are set out in the associated Planning Applications Committee report/minutes, along with the responses of statutory consultees to the application, such as SCC Highways.
PO1035	Mrs Shelagh Wood	Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	Object	OC055 is 8.58 hectares in a rural location where Blythe Business Park already has room within it's existing site for expansion without moving in to the Special Landscape Area..	The reasons for the need for additional employment land by the applicant are set out in their application particulars to SMD/2014/0576. Note that since the adoption of the SMDC Core Strategy in 2014 there is no longer a special landscape area designation across the District.
PO1494	Mr Roger Holdcroft			Object	We bought our house, the above address, 9 years ago, delighted with the rural Moorlands aspect and have been happy here ever since. Last year I was elected to the Parish Council and became Chair in May 2015. However, this letter represents my own view and is not the result of a parish Council discussion, though I am sure that many in the community share my views. I have to say that I am appalled at recent planning decisions and latest proposals affecting our Parish. The recently passed plans for Blythe Park, Cresswell, suggesting that 160 houses should be built there as well industrial units is completely overwhelming for the hamlet community, that boasts no amenities, no shop, no medical services and very limited public transport. The Northern Gateway plan can only be seen as preposterous addition to the already massive effects planned for the Parish of Draycott-in-the-Moors. The effect of all of this development on the Parish will be devastating, mainly in terms of traffic congestion and traffic danger. Uttometer Road is already desperately overloaded, as are the rat runs of Cheadle Road, Breach Lane and Cresswell Lane/Road.	The reasons for the approval of the mixed industrial/housing application SMD/2014/0576 are set out in the associated Planning Applications Committee report/minutes, along with the responses of statutory consultees to the application, such as SCC Highways, SMDC Environmental Health, and the Environment Agency. The reasons for the need for additional employment land by the applicant are set out in their application particulars to SMD/2014/0576.

					These three lanes are dangerous, have pinch points, indeed our wall has been run into 3 times in nine years. Uttoxeter Road by the Draycott Arms is a very dangerous junction and the road up to Totmonslow is almost a pinch point in itself. The thought of the planned roundabout on Uttoxeter Road/Cresswell Lane junction as well as all of extra vehicles can only back up traffic in all directions increasing hazards and the risk of more accidents. The other main issue is the lack of infrastructure in the parish, no school, nearby schools full, no medical services, no public transport, no shop, not suitable for an extra 160 house nor for a traveller's site, which would again increase traffic. Sad to say, there is also no social infrastructure to welcome these extra people into the community. Surely there are brown field sites nearby which could be used for the industrial units to ease the burden on Draycott and especially Cresswell. The former Fole dairy site and the Blythe Bridge/Meir Heath Creda site would both preferable to using the Blythe Park Cresswell land with its additional issues of contamination and flooding. It has to be said, finally, that if any of the Cresswell development takes place and it is now passed, then surely nothing else should or need to be imposed upon the Parish in the Local Plans. It would seem that SMDC holds Draycott in little regard, no doubt due to its distance from Leek, on the edge of the Moorlands area.	In the event of allocation of the Northern Gateway opportunity area for the uses set out in the preferred options consultation; subsequent applications would still need to demonstrate that they were acceptable against policy. The Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. Fole Dairy already has permission under SMD/2013/0028 for mixed residential employment scheme. In the event this scheme expires unimplemented existing employment sites in the District are already protected under Local Plan Policies. The Creda site lies outside the Staffordshire Moorlands therefore would be subject to separate policies. Future proposals arising within the Draycott area of the Staffordshire Moorlands would be assessed against all relevant Local and National

						Policies.
PO8996	Mr Nick Holdcroft			Object	Reference: SMD/2014/0576 - Land at Blythe Park, Sandon Road, Cresswell Planning Application Site Allocations – Ref OC055 Blythe Park, 8.58 Ha Employment I am writing as a very concerned and disgusted resident of Sandon Close, Cresswell, in order object in the strongest possible terms to this totally inappropriate and unnecessary development, which is proposed in the most unsuitable of locations. Summary of Objections - The Facts Cresswell is a 'small' hamlet of around a 130 properties; to allow the construction of an additional 168 houses, would more than DOUBLE the size of the hamlet (an increase in size of around 125%). To allow the expansion of the business park from 31,500 sqm to 64,980 sqm by adding a further 33,480 (an increase of 106%) would more than DOUBLE the size of the business park Both areas of land proposed for development by the developer are green field sites which are home to an abundance of wildlife and parts are classed as flood plain by the Environment Agency Building on this green field land would also exacerbate the problem of flooding The rural road infrastructure was not built for nor is suitable for the large increase in traffic that this development would bring. Cresswell is not even mentioned once by name and it doesn't even feature on the map contained within the SMDC Core Strategy In the report to the SMDC Planning Applications Committee the Planning Officer stated: In summary: Given the open countryside greenfield location, the housing element has not been justified in terms of location or scale and neither has the scale of industrial expansion to Blythe Business Park been justified. An exploration of brownfield alternatives has not occurred and the location seems unsustainable in terms of the proposed housing, given the Spatial Strategy's identifications of settlements elsewhere as the basis of future sustainable housing. Even if Cresswell were deemed to be a village, the scale of housing bears no relation to its current size and role. With regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 52, the Council did not consider the new settlement 'option' as a sustainable alternative during Core Strategy preparation. The scheme raises substantial sustainability concerns if NPPF paragraph 14 applies. Refer also to NPPF paragraph 55. The housing does not appear to be required under an enabling arrangement to the business park expansion. The proposals do not appear to avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the site or provide a sequential search of alternatives. Given the substantial policy concerns, the proposal cannot be supported. JMPTransport Solutions (renowned consultants within the sustainable transport planning field) who independently review the Transport Assessment (TA) and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) submitted as part of this planning application, concluded that: The Traffic Assessment and Framework Travel Plan cannot be considered sound. Without considerable investment in sustainable transport provision this site cannot be promoted as sustainable. A properly arranged residential development of around 2000 households could justify a new commercial – and more importantly – viable bus service. This highlights that the proposed development cannot justify a viable bus service. The scale of proposed development is not considered appropriate to the rural nature of the road network. the fundamental suitability of the proposed development is unacceptable on transport grounds and located in a wholly unsuitable location for a development of this size Traffic – Rat Run It is well known that any traffic problems on the A50 result in traffic trying to avoid hold ups by travelling through Tean, Draycott, Cresswell, Saverley Green, Fulford, Hilderstone and Blythe Bridge. This is without additional industrial traffic as well as residents from another 168 dwellings which will severely compound the existing traffic problems. Quite simply, the rural lanes were not built for such volumes of traffic. Cresswell Road – Road Width Cresswell lane is only 5.16m wide at the pinch point just above the Isaac Walton public house. The maximum width of an HGV is 2.55m (excluding the mirrors), which means there is only a gap of 6cm between two passing HGVs (refer to JMP report). The Motion (applicant's consultants) TA claimed the road was 5.2m	If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development.

					wide. Increasing the volume of traffic to / from the business park, in particular HGV's increases the risk of accidents given the narrow width of the lane; it could also create a regular back log of traffic on to the level crossing. Approving this planning application would result in a serious health and safety risk, due to a huge increase in HGV construction traffic on a very narrow unsuitable country lane. I am aware from fellow residents of Cresswell, that Paull Hurdus (SCC Highways Authority), was due to meet residents on site to review the dangerous and narrow nature of Cresswell Road, but he failed to attend. SMDC are reliant on SCC Highways Authority for their highways related expertise when evaluating planning applications and it is our considered opinion based on evidence we have gathered, that the highways elements of this planning application have not been properly considered. T-Junction – Cresswell Road / Uttoxeter Road At peak times, there is a tail back of traffic at this extremely busy junction on Cresswell road, this is without an increase in traffic from another 168 houses and further expansion of the industrial estate into green belt. The introduction of a roundabout will exacerbate this problem and create access difficulties for the adjacent residents in Draycott. Proposed Roundabouts in Cresswell and Draycott Relocating the site entrance, would mean creating the proposed roundabout even closer to existing homes which is totally unacceptable and would cause further stress and anxiety for the residents of Cresswell and Draycott. As the SMDC Planning Officer highlighted in the report to Planning Committee, an evaluation of alternative brown field sites has not been undertaken. Brown field sites in or near to larger towns which are much better served by an adequate transport network, existing bus routes or near to train stations and access to amenities such as schools, hospitals, doctors and shops, must surely rank more favourably, are far more sustainable and fit more closely with your Core Strategy and NPPF than any development proposed for a small rural hamlet? In general terms the role of the planning authority must be to ensure that only necessary and appropriate developments are approved in suitable locations. Surely any development must be proportional and incremental to the existing size of a village or hamlet ? For instance say, 1 or 2% over an appropriate period of time, but not to increase the size of a hamlet by 125% in terms of houses or 106% in terms of an employment site ? This is totally unacceptable and disproportionate and really requires serious reconsideration. Allowing this unnecessary development would: totally destroy the hamlet result in increased traffic problems and the potential for accidents, not only in Cresswell but in surrounding villages and hamlets result in the increased risk of flooding destroy the habitat of an abundance of rare wildlife disturb land that has not been tested for contamination result in houses built close to a remediated tip and it would ruin the views and areas of open countryside Quite simply, the small hamlet of Cresswell is not an appropriate location for the construction of 168 residential dwellings or an additional 33,480 sqm of industrial development.	
PO9529	Mr K Tunnicliffe			Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw Your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts	The Council consults internally with its own Environmental Health Team and they did not raise objections to TR002 or OCC055. EH Conditions were attached to consent SMD/2014/0576 . If the Council considered that a development may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. In addition the Council continually monitors air quality across the District and regularly

					convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	undertakes review and assessments of this data to identify areas where the traffic could have an unacceptable impact on local air quality. Policy SD4 in the emerging Local Plan covers controls of all forms of pollution arising from development. The reasons for the approval of the mixed industrial/housing application SMD/2014/0576 are set out in the associated Planning Applications Committee report/minutes, along with the responses of statutory consultees to the application, such as SCC Highways, SMDC Environmental Health, and the Environment Agency.
PO9534	Mr C Salt			Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the	• See response to PO9529 • See response to PO 204

					area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	
PO9462	Mrs P Marsden			Object	I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house.	• See response to PO9529 • See response to PO 204
PO9947	St Modwen Development Ltd	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Object	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: Consultation Document allocates site OC055 (Cresswell) for employment use, amounting to 8.58 hectares. The 35ha of land (Gross Requirement) for SMDC is distributed across Leek, Biddulph, Cheadle and the Rural Areas. The Rural Areas receive 10.5 ha of this total, of which the residual requirement is 6.37ha. It is not clear from the Document or evidence base how this 6.37ha residual requirement relates to the Gross Allocation of 8.58ha and request this be clarified. We would also refer to our earlier comments in response to question 2, regarding the rural area allocation at Cresswell. Within Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, there are no employment land allocations made to serve local needs. [Our] advisors have indicated that the principal market sectors that could be attracted to Blythe	The preferred options consultation document explains that completions/commitments were deducted from the 2011-2031 employment land requirements for each of the four areas, leaving the corresponding residual requirements. Note that the emerging Local Plan proposes the allocation of 48.5ha for mixed employment/residential uses as Blythe Vale,

Question 38 Do you have any comments on the employment site for the Rural Areas?

					Bridge and Forsbrook are likely to include small to medium size industrial and warehousing (i.e. local market) as well as more strategic requirements. Whilst Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook boast excellent road and rail connectivity, new homes, and a strong and varied base of facilities and services, the Local Plan has failed to allocate any employment land to serve local needs to this area. [The nearest local employers are beyond the District boundary eg Meyer Timber factory]. The St Modwen proposals present an opportunity for a mixed use development site. The principle of employment use has already been accepted - extant planning permission. St Modwen have extended the time on the original planning permission in 2011 (11/00405/REM), and having previously secured consent for access. However site has been difficult to progress, largely because of the development's viability and the market for office accommodation in this location. St Modwen have applied for Growth Funding in an effort to unlock the potential of this site, but there is no certainty as to whether this bid will be successful and it will take time for the bid to be processed. the site's potential is arguably best unlocked by a mix of uses, residential and employment that can be delivered through a more flexible and attractive, market facing planning permission. Moving away from the restrictions of the Development Brief to reflect the requirements of modern business will also be important, for example ensuring the use class is not limited to Class B1.	Blythe Bridge. The allocation Policy DSR1 does not specify that employment uses be restricted to B1 use. A masterplan will be prepared for the site which will look at the details of the development and sustainable transport and rail and road links to and from the site to Blythe Bridge and the surrounding area.
PO9731	Scentarea Ltd	Ms Rosie Cotterill		Support	Covering letter and map submitted [attached] supporting Preferred Options employment site OC055: The intention of the proposed approved employment/housing approval SMD/2014/0576 is to create a sustainable addition to Cresswell by expanding a successful business park and bolstering the provision of residential dwellings, including much needed affordable housing. The proposed development will also be beneficial for the wider District providing housing and employment land to meet an identified need. as this permission has already granted industrial development on OC055 site, Scentarea Ltd therefore fully supportive of the Council's intention to allocate this site There are a number of existing businesses on the site who are committed to growing in this location once larger employment units have been developed and are available. Scentarea also often receives enquiries from other businesses looking to move to the site who, without the development of new units, cannot currently be accommodated. Given that western portion SMD/2014/0576 has already been granted residential planning permission, it would seem logical that the western portion of the site is also allocated for residential development. This will help meet the housing need identified in the adopted Core Strategy in line with para 47 NPPF. The site is not in the Green Belt and would therefore allow for the Council to meet some of their identified need on non-Green Belt land. The Environmental Impact Assessment submitted in support of the planning application demonstrates that there are no environmental constraints on site restricting development which could not be overcome through mitigation.	Support for OC055 noted. As Cresswell is not identified as a 'larger' or 'smaller' village in the emerging Local Plan (subject to the rural area strategy), the Council does not consider it appropriate to make an allocation for housing at this location.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
PO1277	Mr Yendole	Stafford Borough Council			Stafford Borough Council has a border with Staffordshire Moorlands in the Cresswell and Blythe Bridge areas. A Regional Investment Site is proposed at Blythe Vale alongside the A50 to support the Northern Gateway regeneration initiative; Stafford Borough Council supports a focus on economic development in this locality through the Regional Investment Site, an employment allocation of 8.5 hectares proposed as an extension to Blythe Business Park at Cresswell as well as the Hadleigh Park Major Developed Site within Stafford Borough.	Support	Comments noted
PO205	Mrs Jacqueline Leach				Takes up too much Green belt land and will cause chaos on the Blythe Bridge Roundabout especially if the A50 is closed due to an accident. All traffic will be redirected through Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Tean.	Object	- The site is not within the Green Belt - The site is located on a main road with substantial road frontage and it is considered subject to appropriate masterplanning it will be possible to achieve a satisfactory access to the site.
PO1348	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			The Northern Gateway Opportunity Site has not been covered by the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys.	Object	The Local Wildlife Assessment (2017) found the site had some biodiversity value notably one of the hedgerows and two of the ponds. The Study recommended further survey to assess the site.
PO944	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw				Totally unnecessary - just completely the wrong location. With the local focus on the Cresswell/Blythe Park application and the local action group opposing it the Northern Gateway option suddenly rears its head. In the Draycott map it doesn't show at all - I have to look at the Blythe Bridge map to see its potential impact. The A50 is not a good road to develop along unless you consider more the location near Toyota with its proximity to the M1.	Object	- Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites need to be included. - The site is designated in the Core Strategy for high quality employment use.
PO1036	Mrs Shelagh Wood		Mrs Shelagh Wood	VVSM	This alongside the Blythe Business Expansion, 25 houses in Draycott, 168 houses in Cresswell and very poor road infrastructure will plus a traveller's site will lead to utter chaos on the roads.	Object	Development on the site would be subject to appropriate masterplanning which would consider the impact of the site on the surrounding area
PO1493	Mr Roger Holdcroft				We bought our house, the above address, 9 years ago, delighted with the rural Moorlands aspect and have been happy here ever since. Last year I was elected to the Parish Council and became Chair in May 2015. However, this letter represents my own view and is not the result of a parish Council discussion, though I am sure that many in the community share my views. I have to say that I am appalled at recent planning decisions and latest proposals affecting our Parish. The recently passed plans for Blythe Park, Cresswell, suggesting that 160 houses should be built there as well industrial units is completely overwhelming for the hamlet community, that boasts no amenities, no shop, no medical services and very limited public transport. The Northern Gateway plan can only be seen as preposterous addition to the already massive effects planned for the Parish of Draycott-in-the-Moors. The effect of all of this development on the Parish will be devastating, mainly in terms of traffic congestion and traffic danger. Uttoxeter Road is already desperately overloaded, as are the rat runs of Cheadle Road, Breach Lane and Cresswell Lane/Road. These three lanes are dangerous, have pinch points, indeed our wall has been run into 3 times in nine years. Uttoxeter Road by the	Object	- See responses above - New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					Draycott Arms is a very dangerous junction and the road up to Totmonslow is almost a pinch point in itself. The thought of the planned roundabout on Uttoxeter Road/Cresswell Lane junction as well as all of extra vehicles can only back up traffic in all directions increasing hazards and the risk of more accidents. The other main issue is the lack of infrastructure in the parish, no school, nearby schools full, no medical services, no public transport, no shop, not suitable for an extra 160 house nor for a traveller's site, which would again increase traffic. Sad to say, there is also no social infrastructure to welcome these extra people into the community. Surely there are brown field sites nearby which could be used for the industrial units to ease the burden on Draycott and especially Cresswell. The former Fole dairy site and the Blythe Bridge/Meir Heath Creden site would both be preferable to using the Blythe Park Cresswell land with its additional issues of contamination and flooding. It has to be said, finally, that if any of the Cresswell development takes place and it is now passed, then surely nothing else should or need to be imposed upon the Parish in the Local Plans. It would seem that SMDC holds Draycott in little regard, no doubt due to its distance from Leek, on the edge of the Moorlands area.		
PO9127	Bev Reardon				Now to summarise my objections for the Northern Gateway Site: Increased traffic on the A50 Increased traffic on adjoining roads. For 1 & 2: Reasons for objections are: Health and wellbeing: (as above) noise pollution, light pollution, congestion, increased travel time, speeding, vibration and associated damage to property. The road noise from the A50 can be heard in my garden on Uttoxeter Road. It is very loud and almost like white noise. It is impossible to sleep with windows open because of this. Any increase in traffic will seriously affect my health and wellbeing and create a stressful environment which will be in detriment to my mental health. Increased Travel Time: I travel to Derby from Blythe Bridge roundabout everyday. It takes almost 20 minutes in a queue of traffic to get to the roundabout from my home on Uttoxeter Road because the traffic is always backed up to The Chandni Cottage Restaurant by 7.15am. Congestion: The A50 traffic is also congested and quite frequently at a standstill along the A50 level with Checkley, queuing to the first roundabout for JCB. Accidents: When a lorry overturns at Blythe Bridge junction, the traffic stops in all directions, affecting both the M6 and M1 as well as surrounding routes that are used as diversions for the A50. There have been many collisions on the A50 to date, which will surely become more frequent with extra traffic and an entrance to the business park. 24/7 Noise and light pollution from the Northern Gateway development. I will be very affected by noise and light from the development as my home backs onto the proposed site. The fields at the side of the A50 are currently home to a wide range of wildlife, which I have witnessed from my back garden, including Kingfishers, Great Crested Newts, Foxes, Buzzards, Badgers, Rabbits, Hares, Curlews, Swifts, Woodpeckers, Herons, Dormice and other fabulously diverse	Object	- If the district council considered that a development they may adversely impact on local air quality then the applicant is required to undertake air quality assessments to identify these issues and develop options to mitigate these impacts. - There is a policy in the Local Plan regarding the pollution - See responses above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					species which will all be displaced and lost if the this huge development goes ahead. The Northern Gateway Development must be considered along with the Blythe Park extension, the Traveller Site and the Caverswall Road proposals to fully digest and understand the impact it will have on the surrounding hamlets and villages. The Northern Gateway Development is a massive and very obtrusive development, which would be to the permanent detriment of the rural landscape, there is no "Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment", as all development proposals made by the SMDC are in fact destroying the local environment.		
PO9523	Mr K Tunnicliffe				Now to summarise my objections for the Northern Gateway Site: Increased traffic on the A50 Increased traffic on adjoining roads. For 1 &2: Reasons for objections are: Health and wellbeing: (as above) noise pollution, light pollution, congestion, increased travel time, speeding, vibration and associated damage to property. The road noise from the A50 can be heard in my garden on Uttoxeter Road. It is very loud and almost like white noise. It is impossible to sleep with windows open because of this. Any increase in traffic will seriously affect my health and wellbeing and create a stressful environment which will be in detriment to my mental health. Congestion: The A50 traffic is also congested and quite frequently at a standstill along the A50 level with Checkley, queuing to the first roundabout for JCB. Accidents: When a lorry overturns at Blythe Bridge junction, the traffic stops in all directions, affecting both the M6 and M1 as well as surrounding routes that are used as diversions for the A50. There have been many collisions on the A50 to date, which will surely become more frequent with extra traffic and an entrance to the business park. 24/7 Noise and light pollution from the Northern Gateway development. I will be very affected by noise and light from the development as my home backs onto the proposed site. The fields at the side of the A50 are currently home to a widerange of wildlife, which I have witnessed from my back garden, including Kingfishers, Great Crested Newts, Foxes, Buzzards, Badgers, Rabbits, Hares, Curlews, Swifts, Woodpeckers, Herons, Dormice and other fabulously diverse species which will all be displaced and lost if the this huge development goes ahead. The Northern Gateway Development must be considered along with the Blythe Park extension, the Traveller Site and the Caverswall Road proposals to fully digest and understand the impact it will have on the surrounding hamlets and villages. The Northern Gateway Development is a massive and very obtrusive development, which would be to the permanent detriment of the rural landscape, there is no "Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment", as all development proposals made by the SMDC are in fact destroying the local environment.	Object	See responses above
PO9531	Mr C Salt				Now to summarise my objections for the Northern Gateway Site: Increased traffic on the A50 Increased traffic on adjoining roads. For 1 &2: Reasons for objections are: Health and	Object	See responses above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					wellbeing: (as above) noise pollution, light pollution, congestion, increased travel time, speeding, vibration and associated damage to property. The road noise from the A50 can be heard in my garden on Uttoxeter Road. It is very loud and almost like white noise. It is impossible to sleep with windows open because of this. Any increase in traffic will seriously affect my health and wellbeing and create a stressful environment which will be in detriment to my mental health. Congestion: The A50 traffic is also congested and quite frequently at a standstill along the A50 level with Checkley, queuing to the first roundabout for JCB. Accidents: When a lorry overturns at Blythe Bridge junction, the traffic stops in all directions, affecting both the M6 and M1 as well as surrounding routes that are used as diversions for the A50. There have been many collisions on the A50 to date, which will surely become more frequent with extra traffic and an entrance to the business park. 24/7 Noise and light pollution from the Northern Gateway development. I will be very affected by noise and light from the development as my home backs onto the proposed site. The fields at the side of the A50 are currently home to a widerange of wildlife, which I have witnessed from my back garden, including Kingfishers, Great Crested Newts, Foxes, Buzzards, Badgers, Rabbits, Hares, Curlews, Swifts, Woodpeckers, Herons, Dormice and other fabulously diverse species which will all be displaced and lost if the this huge development goes ahead. The Northern Gateway Development must be considered along with the Blythe Park extension, the Traveller Site and the Caverswall Road proposals to fully digest and understand the impact it will have on the surrounding hamlets and villages. The Northern Gateway Development is a massive and very obtrusive development, which would be to the permanent detriment of the rural landscape, there is no "Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment", as all development proposals made by the SMDC are in fact destroying the local environment.		
PO9455	Mrs P Marsden				With the overview of all the linked sites named above, (Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC	Object	• See responses above • The Council has recently undertaken a Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study 2016 to form part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan and assess the potential landscape impacts of the development allocations, the study found the site is of medium/high landscape sensitivity and recommended landscape mitigation measures to reduce the impact of any development • Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house. Now to summarise my objections for the Northern Gateway Site: Increased traffic on the A50 Increased traffic on adjoining roads. For 1 &2: Reasons for objections are: Health and wellbeing: (as above) noise pollution, light pollution, congestion, increased travel time, speeding, vibration and associated damage to property. The road noise from the A50 can be heard in my garden on Uttoxeter Road. It is very loud and almost like white noise. It is impossible to sleep with windows open because of this. Any increase in traffic will seriously affect my health and wellbeing and create a stressful environment which will be in detriment to my mental health. Congestion: The A50 traffic is also congested and quite frequently at a standstill along the A50 level with Checkley, queuing to the first roundabout for JCB. Accidents: When a lorry overturns at Blythe Bridge junction, the traffic stops in all directions, affecting both the M6 and M1 as well as surrounding routes that are used as diversions for the A50. There have been many collisions on the A50 to date, which will surely become more frequent with extra traffic and an entrance to the business park. 24/7 Noise and light pollution from the Northern Gateway development. I will be very affected by noise and light from the development as my home backs onto the proposed site. The fields at the side of the A50 are currently home to a widerange of wildlife, which I have witnessed from my back garden, including Kingfishers, Great Crested Newts, Foxes, Buzzards, Badgers, Rabbits, Hares, Curlews, Swifts, Woodpeckers, Herons, Dormice and other fabulously diverse species which will all be displaced and lost if the this huge development goes		

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					ahead. The Northern Gateway Development must be considered along with the Blythe Park extension, the Traveller Site and the Caverswall Road proposals to fully digest and understand the impact it will have on the surrounding hamlets and villages. The Northern Gateway Development is a massive and very obtrusive development, which would be to the permanent detriment of the rural landscape, there is no "Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment", as all development proposals made by the SMDC are in fact destroying the local environment. I write in reference to the above site options consultation and I also wish to include the impact of other sites namely BB041(Caverswall Road) and OC055 (Blythe Park expansion, Cresswell) because if all sites are granted permission, it will result in the diminution of the quality of life for all residents of Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook, Draycott and Cresswell, along with increased traffic problems for residents of Hilderstone. With the overview of all the linked sites named above		
PO9948	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Development Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: St Modwen own part of the land that is allocated as the Northern Gateway Opportunity Site [see Evidence Report] The NPPF recognises and emphasises the importance of using up to date market signals. In addition, due reference is made to market factors in PPG, particularly the three principal tests of allocating development land - suitability, availability and achievability. Refer to example of Blythe Valley Business Park RIS(Solihull MBC) . The Solihull Local Plan - Inspector's Report stated that this RIS, which was originally restricted to B1 uses, should allow proposals to incorporate new housing (because) with RSS revocation and changes in the economy and business demand, there is a need for this concept to evolve and for these business parks to be reinvigorated, without detracting from their regional economic significance. It would also help to provide a more sustainable, multi-dimensional community. it would be very difficult to deliver and complete this business park without a vital element of residential development. Other former RISs in the West Midlands include residential uses in their development (such as at i54 & Longbridge). The PBA/JLL West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (September 2015) (WMSESS) notes that the RISs serving the metropolitan area of Birmingham have been successful, with high occupancy. However. it is particularly apparent that there are a significant number of locally based operators that have located to RISs.Report also states the distinction between B1c/B2 and B8 not always being possible to make. Blythe Vale only approved for B1 uses in Council's development brief (but Core Strategy para 8.1.78 recognises the need for the original 1997 development brief to be reviewed, include scope for further uses).We support such a revision and consider that the Local Plan should equally make this reference when new policies are prepared in subsequent stages of the Local Plan. Allocation of employment	Object	Comments noted.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Consultee Comment	Support / Object/ General Comment	Officer Response
					land at Blythe Vale (including if this is part of a mixed use scheme) should not be restricted to specific sectors, and should be market driven and include both ancillary and enabling development. The introduction of a more flexible range of employment uses which meet a local need alongside a regional one, coupled with a residential element on part of the site is necessary. This will open up the opportunities for cross funding, early delivery, the provision of infrastructure etc. There are also opportunities to deliver ancillary development – a local centre or public house. Connectivity to the urban area of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook can be enhanced through off site highway improvements etc		
PO52	Mr P Rushton				SMDC involvement in the Northern Gateway Opportunity is to be applauded but the Moorlands strength within that partnership is as a gateway to the countryside and prestigious Peak District. Tourism and attractive market towns can provide a prosperous Moorlands future but the natural and irreplaceable resource of countryside must be protected.	General comment	• Comment noted
PO833	Ms Alison Conybeare				Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	General comment	• Comment noted
PO2795	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Northern Gateway Opportunity Site (Preferred Employment Allocation). The south eastern part of this site is within Source Protection Zones 1 and 2. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place within Source Protection Zones 1 and 2. For example we would object to any storage of hazardous substances and would only permit the discharge to ground of clean roof water in Source Protection Zone 1.	General comment	• Comment noted
PO9949	St Modwen Developments Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Clarificatory letter dated 5th July 2016 received [attached] , further to original representations, regarding Growth Deal 3 funding.	General comment	• Comment noted

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO13	Mr Robert Llewellyn		General comment	There are significant road safety risks to the vehicular access of this site. The exit and entry are directly from and onto a dangerous bend on an unrestricted speed dual carriageway. This is further complicated by the close proximity to a major junction providing access to Blythe Bridge. There is no right turn out of this site and vehicles exiting the site will be required to turn left and traverse the east bound carriageway within less than 100 metres in order to access the west bound carriageway sliproad, in conjunction with the traffic exiting the Blythe Bridge turn off. A number of the vehicles from the travellers site will be large twin axle caravans which are not particularly manouverable or responsive. A solution would be to instal a new roundabout system at this junction but this may be economically unviable for the establishment of 8+ pitches. Some consideration should also be given to the potential increase in road traffic that may occur along this stetch of road, should the development at OCO55 Cresswell and the Blythe Vale Northern Gateway Site go ahead.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council consults with SCC Highways/SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to development of TR002 for traveller use subject to junction assessments; local pedestrian and cycle links will also require consideration. Note that the Cresswell site OC055 was granted outline employment consent in 2016. In the event of future planning applications the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate).
PO834	Ms Alison Conybeare		General comment	Please seek the local residents views. These are the most important.	Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO432	Mr David John Allen		General comment	None at Present	Comments noted.
PO568	Mr Peter Cowie		General comment	These need to be very sensitively sited with local resident support and stringent regulation and monitoring.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of 'Preferred' allocation sites from wider sites. This includes landscape impact evidence. The most recent 2016 landscape

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					impact study concluded site TR002 has low visual prominence due to screening provided by the mature hedgerows and trees which enclose the site, therefore is of low landscape sensitivity. Note that landscape evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects 'Preferred' sites. Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation.
PO871	Rommelrath		General comment	My comments relate to travellers sites. The council and the independent government officer should ensure that any travellers sites should be sited on only suitable locations. They need to consider personally how they would like to live next to one of these sites. The sites should NOT be adjacent to houses where the impact will be detrimental to the homes of local people and have a significant impact on the value of their properties. There are many brown field/ employment sites throughout Staffordshire Moorlands which can be used for such sites and it is unfortunate that the public was not given an opportunity to put these sites forward. (This should be re-visited by both the council and the independent government officer to make the process a fair one) There are brown field sites unsuitable for housing which are suitable traveller sites. These areas should be chosen and NOT landscape areas.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites, is set out in the Government's NPPF, and its resultant 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', as well as the Council's own Local Plan Policy. These set out the importance of sustainability/accessibility of sites, to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure; and that development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements should be very strictly limited. Councils must also consider local amenities and impacts upon landscape and local infrastructure; and the scale of sites should relate to their surroundings. Brownfield sites are also preferred. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4786					allocation at Examination. Note however that exiting employment sites in the District are generally protected from loss to other uses under Local Plan policy. The environmental health policies/legislation that apply to ensure the safety of future housing, also apply to future traveller accommodation. The Council conducted a 'call for sites' as part of its 2015 Site Options public consultation, and has also entertained site suggestions in subsequent consultations. • See para response to PO568 about landscape evidence Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
	PO2789	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency	General comment	TR002: According to information held by the Environment Agency this site is located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.
	PO7381	Mr Andy Graham		General comment	A great many local residents were incensed when the existing unlawful traveller site was being seriously considered to be extended. Thankfully, this was rejected and officers have categorically said that this site would not be considered as appropriate. It is envisaged that once a suitable traveller site is developed that this family will be moved when their temporary planning permission expires in 2017. We would really appreciate you taking on board all that residents have taken the
					The Council consults internally with its own Environmental Health Team and they did not raise objections to this site, subject to appropriate conditions. The current temporarily approved travellers site adjacent to Rose Cottage Checkley, was not included in the 2016 Preferred Options consultation. Future proposals to extend use of this site would be assessed against relevant Development Plan policies including the Government's NPPF & PPTS, and the

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				time to communicate both now and in Round 1 of the consultation period.	Council's Local Plan policy and GTAA evidence.
PO7404	Ms Heather Graham	Checkley Village Awareness Committee	General comment	The unlawful occupation of the land at Four Trees by a traveller family has continued since 2007. It is understood that the temporary planning permission will expire in 2017 and it is hoped that the council will give precedence for this family to move to an authorised site. Many residents believe that the village is vulnerable to a possible extension of this site as long it is allowed to remain in situ, as had recently been the case. Very significantly, this site and its potential extension threatens the long term future of the Cricket Club. The government has recognised the need to encourage sports in the community and Checkley Cricket Club is a prime example of the importance of such a facility in a rural community where it makes an indeterminate contribution to the community.	Temporary consent SMD/2014/0572 will expire on 06/01/2018. Therefore the current presence on the site is not unlawful. The Council's adopted open space/playspace policies already protect existing areas of open space of the District. This includes Checkley Cricket Club. The Council is currently updating its evidence regarding the quantity and quality of existing open spaces across the District which will include an updated playing pitch strategy: this evidence will assist the Council in the preparation of its emerging Local Plan.
PO9	Mrs Jill Steele		Object	Access to the main road in this location is very difficult and busy – also there is good quality housing very close to the site and this will have a major detrimental effect on the value and desirability of this housing stock. Again local schools are already oversubscribed for those residents who actually pay council tax and have lived in their chosen area for many years. Although 8 pitches may seem low I would suspect that this is the thin end of the wedge and the site could well attract many more travellers, pitching illegally with all the associated problems this brings for police, council and residents.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts. The Council consults with SCC Education during Local Plan preparation. SCC have indicated that education contributions from developers may be required to fund additional school places at Forsbrook CE(VC); and potentially other middle- and high schools including Blythe Bridge High

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					School. Future proposals at this site would be assessed against relevant Development Plan policies including the Government's NPPF & PPTS, and the Council's Local Plan policy and GTAA evidence.
PO28	Miss Gabrielle Bailey		Object	I object to this traveller site in Blythe Bridge. It is not clear how many pitches there will be – all I can see is that there will be 8 plus; but it means more people which means more traffic and potentially slow horse and cart traffic which simply cannot be supported without complimentary infrastructure. The main roads through Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook are already gridlocked at certain times of day with queues right back into Forsbrook waiting at the crossroads to Blythe Bridge. People park all the way down the main road in Blythe Bridge which means queues down the road as it's single file. Add this to waiting for the railway crossing at Blythe Bridge and what should be a short journey turns into one where you need to pack sandwiches! With new sites for housing and a massive area now allocated for building to support employment how on earth are residents supposed to get to work or indeed hope to cross Cheadle Road In Forsbrook village? It's dangerous and time consuming as it is. I haven't seen anything on the table as solutions to the infrastructure problems which need to be in place before or alongside any addition to the population.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO09 about which policies future traveller schemes would be assessed against • See para response to PO13 on highways National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered.
PO58	Mr David		Object	From personal experience, and as an older person, I felt	The Planning, Environmental Protection,

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

	Williams			very threatened and worried indeed by the prescence travellers when their caravans were close to my home – as they have been in the past when they were about 2km away. Crime, both reported and unreported, in the area increased significantly and the amount of dirt and refuse in the area of their caravans proliferated considerably too. I have friends of a similar age to myself who live in Blythe Bridge and they are all greatly concerned, particularly the female ones, by this proposal and I'll be encouraging them to express their opposition to this site as soon as possible. SMDC should think again and change this proposal such that travellers sites are never constructed close to any town or village of the Staffs Moorlands.	and Public Health Acts provide various legal remedies regarding the removal of waste that Councils can implement, where they deem appropriate (in addition to littering legislation). The landowner is responsible for site maintenance, under the Public Health Acts. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites
PO261	Mrs S Allt		Object	Why are all the propsed traveller sites in all Blythe Bridge? We have no problems with travellers setting up sites within Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge surely SMDC should be propsing sites where there are issues with travellers setting up camp on local sites. I cannot understand the justification of it being close to the A50 and therefore the best option if this were the case we would have problems with travellers accessing sites within these villages and as stated above we do not. Have the council asked travellers where they want a permanant site? It would seem these sites have been picked at random and will not address any issues of illegal camp sites by travellers within the Moorlands. If this site is to go ahead this will put significant pressure on the very limited services and the already high volumes of traffic within the villages of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook.	The Preferred Options consultation document sets out a single proposed traveller allocation at Blythe Bridge (TR002). Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council takes into account national and local planning policy and guidance on traveller sites when generating site options. The Council included a 'call for sites' in its 'site options' in 2015. The suitability/sustainability characteristics of all original site options deemed to be deliverable, are set out on the Council's website. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. All proposed

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites • The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation • See para response to PO13 on highways • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO206	Mrs Jacqueline Leach		Object	Once again too near the Blythe Bridge Roundabout increasing traffic.	• See para response to PO13 on highways
PO183	Mr Brian Hannah		Object	The proposed travellers site in Blythe bridge is too close to the local community based on all the controversy and reputation which surrounds them. Why do you have to provide a permanent location for travellers when they never stay still and leave a trail of problems in their wake?	• See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites • See para response to PO58 regarding removal of waste
PO257	mr john brown		Object	Site ref tr002 (BLYTHE BRIDGE) Traffic currently exiting blythe bridge at this junction joins the A521 towards draycott (east direction). Anyone returning to blythe bridge must cross the two lanes of traffic and enter a right turn slip road, turn through 180 deg, and travel along a similar slip road on the opposite carriageway, where it mingles with west bound traffic trying to also turn right into blythe bridge. This stream of traffic then crosses the east bound dual carriageway. The proposed travellers site will introduce a new junction approx 10m from the existing. During the	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				inevitable “school run” there will be 2 sets of traffic either crossing each other (BB exit traffic going east vs travellers traffic crossing to right turn slip road), or both heading for the same spot on the right turn slip road. Both sets of traffic will have their vision of eastbound traffic impaired by traffic crossing from westbound to enter BB. On the return from the school run the travellers traffic will exit uttoxeter road onto the dual carriageway, and virtually stop, immediately, to execute the left turn into the site. This will happen twice a day at rush hour, and a further complication is that this identical turning manouvre is used by buses three times every hour. I believe this site will create a very dangerous junction.	
PO436	Mrs Jamie Steadman		Object	I wish to object to the proposed traveller site as feel this will have an adverse effect on the area. The site proposed is an accident hotspot already with numerous car accidents at the junction with the a50/uttoxeter road. This junction is immediately before the proposed site and further traffic turning immediately after the junction would only add to the issue. Access to the site would be directly off the A50 dual carriageway. This is a 60 mph road and I feel allowing further traffic to enter and exit here would create a serious hazard. ..[redacted]... Insurance premiums would increase on our properties in the area. Schools are already oversubscribed, where would the traveller children go to school? Our doctors surgeries and dental practises in the area are also oversubscribed. I wish to reiterate that I strongly object to the proposed traveller site	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts. • See para response to PO09 about educational requirements • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO874	mr jonathan broadhurst		Object	This site would be better as a residential housing site. It is near to large roads making it a better option than BB041. This site is too close to other residential areas for it to be used as a travellers site.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					location of new traveller sites • See para response to PO261 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO784	Dr Jules Allt		Object	The proposed site in Blythe Bridge does not seem to have involved discussion of locations in other parts of Staffordshire Moorlands. It does not seem logical to site it on the periphery of the Moorlands. Placing a legal site there will not stop illegal use of sites in Leek or Biddulph. There has, for example, been recent illegal use of sites in Leek. I have lived near Blythe Bridge for well over a decade and have never known this to be an issue locally. Local councillors have been quoted as saying 'they use the A50' as a reason for suggesting sites in Blythe Bridge, with no evidence to back this up. I would suggest as 'travellers', 'they' can travel to where they seem to want to go, and there is no evidence of a demand to use a site in Blythe Bridge, but plenty of evidence of a wish to use, and an ability to travel to, sites elsewhere in Staffs Moorlands. There is inadequate local infrastructure, eg policing. The police station in Blythe Bridge was shut around a decade ago, and we have minimal local police presence.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO261 regarding the 2011 Gypsy and Traveller Issues and Options Consultation Document • See para response to PO261 about generating traveller site options • See para response to PO871 about call for sites • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites Councils record evidence of unauthorised stops by travellers and report it bi-annually to Government. These records then form part of the evidence of need for future traveller accommodation contained in District's GTAA's. • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO945	Mrs Kathleen Bradshaw		Object	TR002 I fail to see how placing a traveller site in close proximity to two villages – Blythe Bridge and Draycott. Yes it's close to the A50 for easy access but has anyone asked travellers where they would like sites? This rural area doesn't have the infrastructure required for its own residents so how are we expected to take on additional traveller families who would potentially	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				need schools and other services which we don't have in abundance.	• The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO09 about educational requirements
PO1098	Mr Edward Hulse		Object	Object- The proposed traveller's site in Forsbrook – Quabbs Lane During the meeting at Greatwood Community Hall, Tean on the 12/05/2016 the office confirmed that the preferred site TR002 would not be sold by Mr Jackson as a travellers site and there was no compulsory purchase. If Quabbs Lane is reconsidered as a preferred site, we would wish to object, most strongly.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites.
PO882	Mr Elliot Broadhurst		Object	This plot would be better used for housing.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites • See para response to PO261 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO888	mrs diane broadhurst		Object	This site is too close to residential areas. It would be better to use this site for residential development.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					location of new traveller sites. • See para response to PO261 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal
PO998	Ms Natasha Allt		Object	I do not think there has been enough thought put into locating a travellers site in Blythe Bridge, rather than where the travellers seem to want to go, and am concerned about what adverse changes it would bring to our village	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • See response to PO261
PO1005	Mrs Carol Harrison		Object	I do not think that there is appropriate infrastructure for this site. SMDC seem to be trying to locate it on the edge of the Moorlands, rather than satisfy the requirements of the travelling community. There is no evidence of need for a site in Blythe Bridge – there has not been illegal use of sites around the areas, as opposed to other areas of the Moorlands	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO1068	Mr Thomas Allt		Object	I am concerned about crime in the village if this site were allowed. There is no local police station to help reduce any crime that came with the development. I am also worried that it would ruin our lovely village where I was born.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO1013	Mrs Win Allt		Object	The site would be detrimental to the village. There is inadequate policing locally to cope with the issues that often come with such sites. There is no history of use of this area by travellers, and one big site on the periphery of Staffordshire Moorlands does not make sense	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

PO1270	Mr Roger Yarwood	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Object	In our previous submissions we proposed the allocation of a site at Checkley. It is disappointing and surprising that our suggested allocation has not been included. The site is already in use as a Traveller site with a temporary planning permission (application ref. 2014/0572). It has the advantage of being located outside the Green Belt. It should be allocated as a permanent site to partly address the Council's obligation to provide a choice of Traveller pitches.	The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. The Council will have to reach a view regarding the number of outstanding traveller pitches it is required to provided for (as per its GTAA evidence), whether it is expedient to allocate a site(s); and if so the best location to do so. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. In the event of future traveller proposals arising at the temporary Checkley site, these would be assessed against relevant Development Plan policies including the Government's NPPF & PPTS, and the Council's adopted traveller site policy and GTAA evidence.
PO1392	Ms Brenda Hewitt		Object	Development too near the residential area-I do not think that his is site would enhance the local environment which comprises of period / character housing. I question how the type and style of these caravans/mobile homes would bland in and integrate aesthetically in such a setting. Residents adjacent to this site would lose their as privacy and the communal play areas, pitches and waste disposal areas. Highways – Access to the site could only be safely entered and left	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • See para response to PO13 on highways

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4796				via the main dual carriageway road and not through the Village of Blythe Bridge as it is narrow with residents cars parked both sides. Large caravans would cause considerable disruption if Uttoxeter Road running through the village was used. This road serves three local schools, so safety is an issue here. Noise and disturbance – set nearly in the village and so close to the residents would create considerable noise at times of the day and very probably during the night as vehicles tend to compromise of commercial vans/lorries and long vehicles and long mobile homes. SMDC has not presented evidence to support the need for this new traveller's site in the area for this new traveller's site in an area or offer guidance/procedures to address concerns and problems residents could face once this site is established. Who is responsible for maintenance and any issues that would arise? Green Belt land- the purpose site is adjacent to a further green belt land, what guarantee is there that the traveller's site would not expand. Further to increase pitches considerably this would also impact on the residents.	Schemes raising potential environmental health issues would need to satisfy local and national environmental health policies. • The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO784 about travel patterns of travellers • See para response to PO58 about the Planning, Environmental Protection, and Public Health legislation • See para response to PO09 about which policies future traveller schemes would be assessed against • See para response to PO871 about justification for Green Belt sites
PO1393	Ms Brenda Hewitt		Object	The question of noise will affect the residential area The commercial vehicles will add to what is already a congested road The settled community have invested in property to ensure a degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location. A traveller site will be in no way in keeping of the environment as housing comprises of a mix of late Victorian and mid 1930s semidetached properties. Any traveller site would be overlooked by residents No information has been provided that there is a need for a site location is the above location Schools are full to capacity Dr Surgeries are full and appointments are hard enough to get, more people and families will make this situation worse. Traveller's views have been gathered and they do not want to integrate or be close to	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • Schemes raising potential amenity issues would need to satisfy local and national environmental health policies. • See para response to PO13 on highways • See para response to PO1392 about design and landscape policies • See para response to PO871 about

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				residential families Safety and crime prevention will need to be imposed. As seen on other roaming dogs is of a grave concern due to families in the neighbouring areas. At present there is no detailed site plan when this will be available. I feel very concerned and object to this proposed traveller site and the negative effects it will have on our residential village.	policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation • See para response to PO09 about educational requirements • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan
PO1273	Mr J Millar		Object	extremely narrow roads and cant take any futther traffic extremley dangerous all ready for pedestrains community area is very small not fit for purpose roads surroung not fit for caravans already conjested with traffic	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways
PO1274	Mr J Millar		Object	Proposed housing- cavers wall road extremely narrow + could not take any further volume of traffic. Extremely dangerous all ready for pedestrians. Ref TR002 – Community area small not fit for purpose of gypsy camp + roads surrounding area not fit for caravans etc already traffic congestion which is extremely heavy	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways
PO1265	Mr W Harper		Object	Insufficient infrastructure and insufficient drainage this was mooted in the late 1960s and was turned down then for the same reasons the worst place a travellers site boundaries by Blythe Bridge village hall a children's play area and 2 mot garage within a short distance	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • Schemes raising potential amenity issues would need to satisfy local and national environmental health policies The Council consults internally with its own

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4798					Environmental Health Team and they did not raise objections to site TR002 (subject to appropriate conditions). The Council consults with utilities providers, the Environment Agency, and the SCC Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during Local Plan preparation. These bodies did not object to TR002 on drainage/flooding grounds (although the LLFR Officer sought clarification regarding how surface water would be dealt with). The SFRA provides an overview of flood risk from all sources across the District, and will be used alongside formal EA responses regarding proposed allocations. Note that subsequent development proposals would be required to integrate sustainable drainage features into layouts, as required by the Flood and Water Management Act.
	PO1266	Mr G Hulme	Object	To many houses already and do not want a traveller site on my doorstep	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites.
	PO1038	Mrs Shelagh Wood	Object	See answer to Question 39.	• See table regarding question 39
	PO1476	Mr T Brian	Object	Please accept this letter of my comments and objections to the proposed housing development in Forsbrook, particularly BB041 and the travellers camp TR002 The field is green belt and should remain so as it has onto been proven that more housing is needed in Forsbrook,	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO871 about justification for Green Belt sites

Page 4799			which at this time is a village To develop on green belt requires exceptional circumstances. I don't believe this is the case. None of the residents in Manifold Road, Trent Road, Dove Road, Hillside Avenue in the immediate vicinity of BB041 have been notified by any communication from SMDC or its planning department. This could have been In the form of flyers, newsletters, trade locally magazines etc. There has been no postal communication of the intended proposal. It may have been decided that more housing is required in SMDC, but given the size of the area there are certainly more suitable locations than BB041. All properties in Manifold Road which back on to BB041 will be devalued as they will lose the privacy and views from there back garden. It could put some of our younger and most recent residents in Manifold Road at significant risks of negative equity. Trading for health house and garden centre and Foxfield railway could be significantly reduced as its present visitors have a perception of being in the countryside, which in fact are green belt. Due to the location of forsbrook and the fact that it is a village with Ltd amenities and most families with younger children find necessary to own and run 2 cars. More new housing will create more traffic problems. At present the section Caverswall Old Road which was affected is actually a country lane with passing places. This section of road has a national speed limit. Roads used to access this area are country lanes. During school opening times these roads are at present extremely busy. Winter months create more problems using them, Snow ploughs and gritter's would be needed more frequently. That said these roads are part of our area and are wholly acceptable to the current residents my side of forsbrook. To develop them would completely change the area of this countryside. Creating a new junction at	- Residents views have been sought as part of the consultation. The Council must conduct public consultation concerning its emerging Local Plan as set out in the Local Plan regulations (or exceeding these requirements); and in also in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. All stages of the local Plan (including consultations) must be agreed by the elected Council Assembly; and all meetings of the Council Assembly are open to the public. - See para response to PO261 about option sites assessments and sustainability appraisal - Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts. - See para response to PO13 on highways - With regards BB041 SCC Highways do not object but state that key junctions will require assessment including Caverswall Rd/A521 and Caverswall Old Rd/A521. Pedestrian links into Blythe Bridge will require consideration. - Disposal of surface water upon public highways is the legal responsibility of the Highways Authority or Highways England.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				Caverswall Old Road will require major development of this roadway. More houses on Caverswall Road area will create even more delays for the vehicles traversing and joining the A50 at blythe bridge railway crossing. The 2 regular trains each hour 7 days a week already cause chaos. Roads are not too good whichever direction you go in plus they are prone to local flooding.	
PO1495	Mr Roger Holdcroft		Object	The effect of all of this development on the Parish will be devastating, mainly in terms of traffic congestion and traffic danger. Uttoxeter Road is already desperately overloaded, as are the rat runs of Cheadle Road, Breach Lane and Cresswell Lane/Road. These three lanes are dangerous, have pinch points, indeed our wall has been run into 3 times in nine years. Uttoxeter Road by the Draycott Arms is a very dangerous junction and the road up to Totmonslow is almost a pinch point in itself. The thought of the planned roundabout on Uttoxeter Road/Cresswell Lane junction as well as all of extra vehicles can only back up traffic in all directions increasing hazards and the risk of more accidents. The other main issue is the lack of infrastructure in the parish, no school, nearby schools full, no medical services, no public transport, no shop, not suitable for an extra 160 house nor for a traveller's site, which would again increase traffic. Sad to say, there is also no social infrastructure to welcome these extra people into the community. There should be no extra buildings planned whatsoever and a traveller's site so close to the Draycott Moor College could exacerbate local difficulties for residents. I fail to see why none of the proposed such sites were in Biddulph or Leek, but rather located in our vicinity. It would seem that SMDC holds Draycott in little regard, no doubt due to its distance from Leek, on the edge of the Moorlands area.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See para response to PO13 on highways • See para response to PO28 about Infrastructure Delivery Plan • See para response to PO09 about educational requirements • See para response to PO871 about policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites. • The Council consults with recognised traveller organisations, during Local Plan preparation
PO4850	Miss Angela		Object	During the meeting at Greatwood Community Hall,	Note that the Preferred Options does not

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

	Hulse			Tea, on the 12/05/16, the office confirmed that the preferred site TR002 would not be sold by Mr Jackson as traveller's site and here would be no compulsory purchase. If Quabbs Lane is reconsidered as a preferred site we wish to object most strongly. This would be in green belt area and access to it would be dangerous as it is meters away from a blind bend. Any slow moving vehicle's i.e. caravans, carts etc. turning onto an unmade lane opposite the cemetery would be a major concern on this fast road. Over the past few years there have been several fatalities. Traveller's children would be at risk near this road. The site has poor access to roads (A50) Many family members and friends are buried in this Cemetery and the thought of it being opposite a Travellers Site is a sanctuary of peace and quiet which the village appreciates greatly.	contain any site proposals at Quabbs Lane. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval.
4852 page 4801	Miss Angela Hulse		Object	The preferred site BB054 for 70 houses potentially 140 cars will be using Draycott Old Road for access. The lane is notorious for annual flooding from the adjoining fields. You cannot safely access the road to Cheadle from Draycott Old Road without risk, due to the blind bend; some driver's drive around the village to turn around and take the Cheadle Road, this perpetual hazard will just be exacerbated by the increased traffic from the increased traffic from Draycott Old Road. Many villagers use this lane for recreational purposes, like horse riding, cycling, pedestrians, and dog walkers. This benefits health and wellbeing to all. This preferred housing site for 70 homes is on a precious area of Green Belt land and once it's gone it will be lost forever. This ignores David Cameron's pledge to protect Green Belt land. At the moment the roads in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge are grid locked at certain times of the day. We already take the traffic for Alton Towers and surrounding JCB traffic and other HGV's. These roads	See Question 37 table regarding site BB054

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				are dangerous to pedestrians and particularly children and the elderly. We haven't even got a couple of safe places to cross in Forsbrook so a development on this site BB041, I believe has not been carried out, as confirmed at the Tean Meeting. This traffic will also add to the congestion in Forsbrook. We cannot see how such large developments in our village can't cope with the accumulative impact that it has on infrastructure. Schools, Dr's ,sewage, drainage already working at full capacity. All these concerns are and need to be addressed. Before finalising preferred sites.	
PO4855 Page 4802	Mr John Shaw		Object	The preferred site BB054 for 70 houses potentially 140 cars will be using Draycott Old Road for access. The lane is notorious for annual flooding from the adjoining fields. You cannot safely access the road to Cheadle from Draycott Old Road without risk, due to the blind bend; some driver's drive around the village to turn around and take the Cheadle Road, this perpetual hazard will just be exacerbated by the increased traffic from the increased traffic from Draycott Old Road. Many villagers use this lane for recreational purposes, like horse riding, cycling, pedestrians, and dog walkers. This benefits health and wellbeing to all. This preferred housing site for 70 homes is on a precious area of Green Belt land and once it's gone it will be lost forever. This ignores David Cameron's pledge to protect Green Belt land. At the moment the roads in Forsbrook and Blythe Bridge are grid locked at certain times of the day. We already take the traffic for Alton Towers and surrounding JCB traffic and other HGV's. These roads are dangerous to pedestrians and particularly children and the elderly. We haven't even got a couple of safe places to cross in Forsbrook so a development on this site BB041, I believe has not been carried out, as confirmed at the Tean Meeting. This traffic will also add	See Question 37 table regarding site BB054

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				to the congestion in Forsbrook. We cannot see how such large developments in our village can't cope with the accumulative impact that it has on infrastructure. Schools, Dr's ,sewage, drainage already working at full capacity. All these concerns are and need to be addressed. Before finalising preferred sites.	
PO4849	Mr John Shaw		Object	During the meeting at Greatwood Community Hall, Tean, on the 12/05/16, the office confirmed that the preferred site TR002 would not be sold by Mr Jackson as traveller's site and here would be no compulsory purchase. If Quabbs Lane is reconsidered as a preferred site we wish to object most strongly. This would be in green belt area and access to it would be dangerous as it is meters away from a blind bend. Any slow moving vehicle's i.e. caravans, carts etc. turning onto an unmade lane opposite the cometary would be a major concern on this fast road. Over the past few years there have been several fatalities. Traveller's children would be at risk near this road. The site has poor access to roads (A50) Many family members and friends are buried in this Cemetery and the thought of it being opposite a Travellers Site is a sanctuary of peace and quiet which the village appreciates greatly.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Note that the Preferred Options does not contain any site proposals at Quabbs Lane. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval. The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. The Council will have to reach a view regarding the number of outstanding traveller pitches it is required to provided for (as per its GTAA evidence), whether it is expedient to allocate a site(s); and if so the best location to do so.
PO8254	Mr Roger Yarwood	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd	Object	I wish to comment as follows on the above Plan. I represent Mr and Mrs Price, the owners of a Traveller site at Checkley with a temporary planning permission (application ref. 2014/0572). The site identified at Blythe Bridge (TR002) is located in the Green Belt, has a history of enforcement action and refusals for various types of development and it is located very close to	Comments noted. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The policy expectations concerning location of new traveller sites, is set out in the

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4804				housing development and immediately adjacent to a site approved for a house. On these grounds, the delivery of the site may be problematic. A single site for 8 pitches is too large. Sites should not exceed 5 pitches as larger sites give rise to management problems. Small family sized pitches present the best option for assimilation into the community and minimise conflict. If site TR002 is allocated, the number of pitches should be limited to 5 and additional site(s) should be allocated. My clients' site at Checkley should be allocated as a Traveller site. It is already in use as a Traveller site and has the advantage of being located outside the Green Belt. It should be allocated as a permanent site to partly address the Council's obligation to provide a choice of Traveller pitches.	Government's NPPF, and its resultant 'Planing Policy for Traveller Sites', as well as the Council's own adopted Core Strategy Policy H3. These set out the importance of sustainability/accessibility of sites, to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure; and that development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements should be very strictly limited. Councils must also consider local amenities and impacts upon landscape and local infrastructure; and the scale of sites should relate to their surroundings. Brownfield sites are also preferred. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation at Examination. Councils can meet their residual traveller requirements across one or more sites. National traveller policy does not state that sites must be either large or small, but does state for example that the number of pitches proposed should relate to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density; and Councils should consider local environmental quality, and avoid undue pressure on local infrastructure.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					The Council refers to relevant guidance, such as DCLG 2008 Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Were the Council to allocate TR002 (or another) single site; this would not preclude fair determination of schemes arising in other areas of the District, as per PPTS and other relevant policy.
PO9123	Bev Reardon		Object	Proposed Traveller Site TR002: My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller site at TR002 are listed in detail below: The TR002 proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the following policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following document: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following numbered statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site at TR002 is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, as follows: 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. Response: The established community has made it overwhelmingly clear (by over 400 petition votes and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. The SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council refers to relevant guidance, such as DCLG 2008 Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites. See response to PO8254 above New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and

Page 4806			living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. Response: The proposal for TR002 does not take noise into consideration, this is a residential area, located within the existing settled community. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practice and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: • Convenience for residents • Safety for residents Response: Traffic, this site is located facing a high speed road, there is insufficient acceleration space to allow slow moving vehicles safe egress. • Visual and acoustic privacy – both for people living on the site and those living nearby Response: See comment relating to point 4.14 below. In addition the settled community have heavily invested in property in these particular locations to ensure an enhanced degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location, a site at TR002 would destroy this privacy. • Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment Response: A traveller site at location TR002 would in no way be in keeping with the local environment, this is a quiet residential areas comprising of a mix of late Victorian properties and mid 1930's semi-detached properties. • Scope for social integration with the local community. Response: NO evidence provided that substantiates the theory that the G&T community want social integration, in fact the opposite is the case (according to Planning Policy documents), in that the Gypsy and Traveller community prefer an enclosed settlement on the edge of a rural setting. 4.14 As with housing for the settled community, site layout and design should ensure a degree of privacy for	work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. The Council consults with statutory consultees including its internal Environmental Health Team, who did not raise amenity concerns to TR002. The Council consults with SCC Highways/SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to development of TR002 for traveller use subject to junction assessments/; local pedestrian and cycle links will also require consideration. In the event of future planning applications the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). Loss of view and property values are non-material planning considerations. In the event of allocation, subsequent planning schemes would need to conform with local and National amenity and design

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4807			individual households. Response: any traveller accommodation at TR002 would be overlooked by residents on one side, and from the elevated property directly opposite. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes could be up to around 25 metres in length. Response: Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site, high traffic volumes on the A521 Uttoxeter Road, often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at this location would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas eg play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorised caravans. Response: This government 'statement of fact' reinforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behaviour traits that the established community are very much concerned about. 5.32 The site should be designed so that post can be delivered separately for each pitch. Experience has shown that postal deliveries to pitches can be disrupted by complaints about harassment by dangerous dogs so the provision of an individual box at the entry to a pitch would be advisable. Response: This government 'statement of fact' based on past experiences with	policies. The Council formulated a series of options sites for traveller allocation, which appear on the website. These were the subject of sustainability appraisal, which considered road links, access to facilities etc. This assisted the Council in its decisionmaking with regards TR002.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4808			traveller sites highlights further problems that the established community are concerned about, the prospect of dangerous dogs roaming the proposed site at TR002 is of grave concern, especially to the immediate neighbouring families with young children. Page 52: Evidence provided to Select Committee "Gypsy and Traveller families often wish to have small compact and well-managed sites located in areas where they have historically resided and have a network of local family support. Response: There is no evidence to suggest that there has been any gypsy family has historically resided at, or near the proposed site at TR002. There is no evidence that local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites. Page 52 : Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. Response: Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at this particular location TR002. This information has not been provided. 10.19: Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. Response: The government document 'Designing Gypsy sites' provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy (see points 4.36 and 5.32 from the above document). I cannot stress enough that the proposed siting of these developments, in particular TR002 are particularly ill-considered, Yet again another	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				'steamroller' tactic of SMDC to push all developments that are unwanted in other parts of the SMDC district into small hamlets, primarily inhabited by retired persons who do not have internet access and are therefore clearly deemed a soft target.	
PO9162	Mr and Mrs J Cooper		Object	I write to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site at 459, Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge ("the Site "). Whilst my objection is based upon a number of reasons, fundamentally the primary reason for my objection is that the proposal Site put forward by South Moorlands District Council ("SMDC") is in direct contravention of various components of government guidelines and previous statements made by SMDC on this issue. Please note that, amongst other things, I shall be referring to the following documents: 1. DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites and Good Practice Guide DCLG (2012) Planning and policy for traveller sites SMDC 2014 Core Strategy Development Plan Document (inter alia pages 120-121) Gypsy and Traveller Site Options and Issues Appraisal DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide I note that SMDC, when allocating the site as a potential permanent traveller site, have failed to consider the relationship with local landowners and the views of the wider community. The local community has made it abundantly clear by the existing petitions, votes, attendance to public meetings and drop in centres that they do not this want this Site forced upon them. Whilst the local community have set out their reasons for the objections to the Site, the Council does not appear to be actively locating alternative sites (whether green-belt or brown field). This evidences a lack of transparency in the decision making process and, the whole decision making process appears to be based upon the landowner's willingness to sell the Site to the Council – a	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Refer to PO9123 response The Council formulated a series of options sites for traveller allocation, which appear on the website. These were the subject of sustainability appraisal, which considered road links, access to facilities etc. This assisted the Council in its decisionmaking with regards TR002. The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. The Council will have to reach a view regarding the number of outstanding traveller pitches it is required to provided for (as per its GTAA evidence), whether it is expedient to allocate a site(s); and if so the best location to do so. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation at Examination.

Page 4810			premise which has, on numerous occasions been vocalised by the landowner and the wider local community as simply not being true. Indeed, SMDC will, by now, have received an objection to the Site from the current landowners. I set out below a snapshot of the reasoning for the allocation of the Site being SMDC's preferred option: The owner has ruled out traveller site and SMDC have been made aware of this. This does not appear to have been referenced in the allocation proposal. Notwithstanding the fundamental flaws of the allocation process, SMDC have failed to realise the wider constraints and pressures such a site will have on Blythe Bridge Generally – these reasons I set out in sub clauses below, together with a brief analysis of the impact likely to be occasioned by such a site going ahead. A) Implications on traffic and road safety measures. The A50 is widely used as a short cut for HGVs linking the M6 with the M1. This means there are often considerable traffic burdens to the A50 and surrounding roads. The A50 Blythe Bridge roundabout is a notorious hotspot for accidents. So much so that traffic signs have been placed on the roundabout emphasising and warning traffic users of the same. Having the Site in such close proximity to this notorious hotspot would not only be dangerous but borderline negligent. Having a site which, in all likelihood is going to have a number of large vehicles turning into a hidden turning on a fast road (being a national speed limit road). Coupled with the existing entrance to Uttoxeter Road, is likely to have significant detrimental impact to the road layout and structure – which of course, has the knock on effect of additional costs to the site and increase the risk of severe road traffic accidents. Additionally, there is a busy public footpath that is used by children, runners and people walking dogs. Again, the volume of traffic	The Council uses evidence to justify its selection of Preferred Options, including ecological evidence. The 2014 Lockwood Hall Phase I survey of the site concluded that <i>“Although the site has mostly low biodiversity value overall there is a building with potential to support roosting bats and potential for protected species to be present due to the fairly close proximity of two ponds, under refugia and potentially using the area as a basking opportunity”</i> and therefore recommends a number of predevelopment surveys. In 2017 ECUS assessed the potential of the site to qualify as a 'local wildlife site' (such as S.B.I.), concluding <i>“The site has medium ecological value in its potential to support protected species. The site habitats are considered to be of nature conservation value at site level only. However, more information is required regarding the potential for bats, great crested newts and reptiles”</i>, and therefore recommends a number of further surveys. The Council would expect subsequent schemes to take account of this evidence; further Policy NE1 allows for the Council to require ecological mitigatory or compensatory measures where appropriate. Note that ecology evidence must be weighed against all other relevant evidence when the Council selects

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4811			entering the Site throughout the day is likely to increase the likelihood of a pedestrian being injured when doing something as simple as walking/jogging. B) environmental and ecological impact As a resident of Uttoxeter Road, I know first-hand the importance of retaining the green belt. There are a number of animals within close proximity to the site including amphibians, badgers, foxes and various birdlife – I see evidence of these most evenings when relaxing at home. I have concerns that sites such as the Site proposed are renowned for high levels of noise. Such noise pollution would (coupled with the larger scale development proposed by SMDC) be hugely detrimental to the wildlife surrounding the Site. Whilst the costs of carrying out the relevant ecological surveys are vast, alternative sites within close proximity to the site proposed are all viable alternatives. Viable alternatives which appear to not have been considered by SMDC in its allocation process. SMDC are obliged pursuant to the DGLC Designing Gypsy and Travellers Sites Guidance consider the sustainability of the Site including (without limitation) the consideration of noise, pollution and disturbances. Sites such as the Site proposed within the surrounding areas are well known for associated noise and the number of vehicles passing at various times of the day – more importantly, early mornings and late at night. The Site should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations. The proposed site is a green-belt site and, has seemingly been denied planning permission for this reason previously. I understand that planning guidance states that land can only be taken out of a green-belt in 'exceptional circumstances' I shall be grateful if SMDC would care to elaborate on this 'exceptional circumstance' as the allocation document does not	'Preferred' sites. According to the 2006 NERC Act, the Council must in its Planmaking, have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The broad justification for the Council's selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base).

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4812			appear to state this. Similarly, the Planning and Policy for Traveller Sites 2002 (at page 1, Item 4) suggests that “the plan making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development” – have alternative brownfield sites been considered. There are a number of brownfield sites which would be suitable for such a Site which appear to have been ignored by SMDC generally. Additionally, the same guidance states that “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances” as set out above, the proposed Site not only detrimentally impacts the Site itself but ecologically the wider greenbelt that remains protected in SMDC’s allocation. Furthermore, the proposed Site would be in a quiet residential area with almost no industrial/noise polluting uses nearby. Such a site would in no way keeping with the local environment nor be within the characteristics of nearby property. I am yet to find any evidence from SMDC that the Gypsy and Traveller community have substantiated the SMDC’s claims that the community wish for social integration. The local site of similar make-up in Cresswell has evidenced the exact opposite. C) inadequate services In addition to the negative traffic implications with the proposed site, the existing services are also in need of upgrading. The Uttoxeter Road junction where the Site is to be located is well known for problems with flooding when there is a severe downpour of rain. Frankly, the existing sewers and drains are inadequate before the proposed Site is developed never mind after such development. The existing use itself has borderline insufficient capacity and the proposed Site is likely be the tipping point. Again, associated costs make the Site not only detrimental to the locality but will also require a large degree of expensive associated works which would be costly. In	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				conclusion during a time of austerity and cut-backs and an unwillingness for the current landowner to sell the Site to the Council for such purposes, coupled with the complete disregard of planning guidelines and guidance means that I would like to formally object to the Site being allocated to the SMDC local plan. Unbeknown for anyone other than SMDC is the complete disregard to consider alternative brownfield sites. Indeed, the majority of the proposed gypsy sites appear to be within the Blythe Bridge area and the only logical justification is because SMDC wish to dedicate the A50 window to the proposed occupiers of the site. There are a number of brownfield sites within close proximity to the A50 which would be suitable for the proposed Site and would not have the negative implications such a site would have to the Blythe Bridge area. I would respectfully request the Council consider these alternatives of which there are many.	
Page 4813 09155	Mr S Bailey		Object	I strongly object to the proposed travellers' site in Blythe Bridge and the proposed new build houses to be built on Draycott Old Road. The later will create extra traffic along a beautiful stretch of country lane which is very popular with walkers and will spoil an idyllic area of natural beauty. Both sites will extend the urban sprawl ruining a semi rural cluster of villages. Gypsie sites generally bring rubbish and untidiness and will ruin unspoilt countryside, plus they generally exceed the specified population of the sites creating further problems in due time. I also believe these plans will lower the value of property's in the area as Blythe Bridge, Forsbrook and Draycott are currently desirable and popular locations to live.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council consults with SCC Highways/SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to development of either TR002 or BB054 subject to junction assessments and other road improvements. Local pedestrian and cycle links will also require consideration. In the event of future planning applications the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4814					deemed appropriate). In the event of allocation, subsequent planning schemes would need to conform with local and National amenity and design policies. See para response to PO58 about the Planning, Environmental Protection, and Public Health legislation In the case of planning approval of a gypsy site, planning conditions would control the number of pitches on site, and may also control the number of caravans permitted on site. Property values are not considered as material considerations under the Planning Acts.
PO9149	Mr Richard James		Object	I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site proposed to be located on Land to the east of 459 Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge, as described in your planning proposal 'strategic land housing viability study'. My primary reasons for objection are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the following policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter – I have listed a few below (although not extensive) to help you in your proposal. In particular I shall be referring to the following documents: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide DCLG (2012) Planning and policy for traveller sites Site Assessment Form – your ref:	- See response to PO9123 - See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4815			BB087 – Land to the east of 459 Uttoxeter Road My first set of objections are reference to: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site located on land at 459 Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge - is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, in particular: 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: • Visual and acoustic privacy – both for people living on the site and those living nearby Response: See comment relating to point 4.14 below. In addition the settled community have heavily invested in property in these particular locations to ensure an enhanced degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location, a site at 459 Uttoxeter road would destroy this privacy. • Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment Response: A traveller site at location would in no way be in keeping with the local environment, 459 Uttoxeter Road is a quiet residential area comprising of a mix of modern detached desirable properties and mid 1930's semi-detached properties. • Scope for social integration with the local community. Response: NO evidence provided that substantiates the theory that the Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook community want social integration, in fact the opposite is the case, in that the Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook community prefer an enclosed settlement on the edge of a rural setting. Relationship to surrounding land use 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. Response: The	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4816			established community has made it overwhelmingly clear (by petition votes and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Particularly since there are no existing links with travellers within the village, nor history of travellers using the areas as a temporary stop off. The SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. Response: The proposal for land to the west of 459 Uttoxeter Road, Blithy Bridge – do not take noise into consideration, these are both residential areas, located within the existing settled community. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practise and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. Health and safety considerations 3.16 Sites must not be located on contaminated land. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered on that land. Remedial work should only be undertaken by approved contractors in accordance with relevant standards, to ensure the contamination has been remedied to the standard on which housing development would take place. These processes can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where it is financially viable from the outset. Response: The subjective 'Site Assessment Form' carried out by SMDC (although very amateurish in nature) clearly identifies that the proposed site (land to the east of 459	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4817			Uttoxeter Road) has “possible contamination from land fill”. This is clearly at odds with the Health and Safety considerations needed when considering such a development. It is clear that this has not been done by the SMDC. 4.14 As with housing for the settled community, site layout and design should ensure a degree of privacy for individual households. Response: any traveller accommodation at 459 Uttoxeter road would be overlooked by residents on either side, and from the elevated property directly opposite. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes could be up to around 25 metres in length. Response: Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site, high traffic volumes on Uttoxeter Road, often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at this location would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Furthermore vehicle leaving the site to re-join the A50 would inevitably have to head toward the direction of Tean and perform a dangerous U-turn to correct their direction of travel, addition risk when towing caravans as such. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas eg play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorised caravans. Response: This government ‘statement of fact’ re-enforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4818			does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behaviour traits that the established community are very much concerned about. 5.32 The site should be designed so that post can be delivered separately for each pitch. Experience has shown that postal deliveries to pitches can be disrupted by complaints about harassment by dangerous dogs so the provision of an individual box at the entry to a pitch would be advisable. Response: This government 'statement of fact' based on past experiences with traveller sites highlights further problems that the established community are concerned about, the prospect of dangerous dogs roaming the proposed site at 459 Uttoxeter Road and close proximity to the public open space to the rear of the village hall, this of grave concern, especially to the immediate neighbouring families with young children. Page 52 Evidence provided to Select Committee "Gypsy and Traveller families often wish to have small compact and well-managed sites located in areas where they have historically resided and have a network of local family support. Response There is no evidence to suggest that there has been any gypsy family has historically resided at , or near the proposed site at 459 Uttoxeter Road There is no evidence that local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites. Page 52: Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. + 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. Response: Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at this particular location 459 Uttoxeter Road. This information has not been provided. 10.18 As for other	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4819			kinds of development, it is important that members of the local community, whether Gypsies and Travellers or settled residents, are able to feed in views on plans for new sites. Response When will the detailed site plans be made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then this is surely a serious breach of government planning guidelines. 10.19 Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. Response: The government document 'Designing Gypsy sites..' provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy (see points 5.36 and 5.32 from the above document). My objections continued with reference to following document: DCLG (2012) Planning and policy for traveller sites 11. Criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need. Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community. Response: Clearly given the initial (oversubscribed attendance within the village Hall) public petition to the proposals of the Gypsy and Traveller sites around the Blythe Bridge area, the SMDC has not respected the interests of the settled community who are clearly at odds with this type of development and land use. To finish this is clearly an emotive issue, moreover it will have an extremely negative impact of the community cohesion, which is currently thriving.	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				Furthermore, given the residents and the wider community this will affect, it would appear a 'under handed tactic' by the SMDC to hold a drop in session within Upper Tean, Greatwood community Hall approximately 3.2 miles away from the development, when there is an ample facility located at the Blythe Bridge – Forsbrook village hall less than 0.1 miles. Please accept this letter as a clear objection to your proposals, and I trust you will keep me informed of further developments in relation to this matter.	
PO9113	Mr A Hayes		Object	I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge which is currently being considered by yourselves under your planning strategy and Strategic Housing Land Availability Study. My primary reasons for objection are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the various relevant policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following document: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site at the above location is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, in particular: Relationship to surrounding land use 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. I believe that the established community has made it overwhelmingly clear (by petition, votes and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. I consider that the SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4821			strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. I believe that the proposal for land at 459 Uttoxeter Road does not take noise into consideration. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practise and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. This will cause an unnecessary disturbance. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: Protecting Green Belt Areas The proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge is green belt land, therefore the proposal is NOT in accordance with existing planning policies. Additionally Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 1, item 4, bullet point 4: "that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development", Furthermore Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 5, item 14: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development." Safety for residents Although the proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter road is accessed from the dual carriageway portion of the A521 just beyond Blythe Bridge it will be inevitable that traveller vehicles will also pass through the centre of Blythe Bridge along Uttoxeter Road (which is already impacted by large commercial vehicles which	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4822			pass this way) which is already made narrower and difficult to pass by numerous vehicles parked on the road. This has the potential to cause accidents and damage to vehicles and people and also the potential for traveller vehicles to need to mount the pavement to get through. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes can be up to around 25 metres in length. Caravans or larger mobile homes of this size being towed would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit to and from the site. This would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users as the entry point to the proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road would be on a stretch of dual carriageway on the A521 just beyond Blythe Bridge. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas e.g. play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorised caravans. Response: This government 'statement of fact' re-enforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behaviour traits that the established community are very much concerned about. 5.32 The site should be designed so that post can be delivered separately for each pitch. Experience has shown that postal deliveries to pitches can be disrupted by complaints about harassment by dangerous dogs so the provision of an individual box at the entry to a pitch	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4823			would be advisable. Response: This government 'statement of fact' based on past experiences with traveller sites highlights further problems that the established community are concerned about, the prospect of dangerous dogs roaming the proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road is of grave concern, especially to any immediate neighbouring families with young children and also any nearby farm livestock. Page 52: Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. I do not believe that there is sufficient evidence for the need for a site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road and do not believe that this information has been sufficiently provided. 10.18 As for other kinds of development, it is important that members of the local community, whether Gypsies and Travellers or settled residents, are able to feed in views on plans for new sites. Have the detailed site plans been made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then is this a breach of government planning guidelines. 10.19 Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. The government document 'Designing Gypsy sites..' provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy. Finally I believe that a gypsy / traveller site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road will cause undue pressure on the local schools, in particular the 3	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				local primary schools. If the proposed gypsy / traveller site is also likely to operate as a transit site and involve a continued turnover of families then the schools will also be impacted and disrupted by any gypsy / traveller children joining and leaving the classes part way through each of the term times.	
PO9116	Mrs L Hayes		Object	I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge which is currently being considered by yourselves under your planning strategy and Strategic Housing Land Availability Study. My primary reasons for objection are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the various relevant policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following document: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site at the above location is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, in particular: Relationship to surrounding land use 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. I believe that the established community has made it overwhelmingly clear (by petition, votes and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. I consider that the SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4825			disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. I believe that the proposal for land at 459 Uttoxeter Road does not take noise into consideration. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practise and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. This will cause an unnecessary disturbance. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: Protecting Green Belt Areas The proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge is green belt land, therefore the proposal is NOT in accordance with existing planning policies. Additionally Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 1, item 4, bullet point 4: "that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development", Furthermore Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 5, item 14: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development." Safety for residents Although the proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter road is accessed from the dual carriageway portion of the A521 just beyond Blythe Bridge it will be inevitable that traveller vehicles will also pass through the centre of Blythe Bridge along Uttoxeter Road (which is already impacted by large commercial vehicles which pass this way) which is already made narrower and difficult to pass by numerous vehicles parked on the road. This has the potential to cause accidents and damage to vehicles and people and also the potential for	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4826			traveller vehicles to need to mount the pavement to get through. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes can be up to around 25 metres in length. Caravans or larger mobile homes of this size being towed would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit to and from the site. This would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users as the entry point to the proposed site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road would be on a stretch of dual carriageway on the A521 just beyond Blythe Bridge. Page 52: Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. + 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. I do not believe that there is sufficient evidence for the need for a site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road and do not believe that this information has been sufficiently provided. 10.18 As for other kinds of development, it is important that members of the local community, whether Gypsies and Travellers or settled residents, are able to feed in views on plans for new sites. Have the detailed site plans been made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then is this a breach of government planning guidelines. 10.19 Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. The government document 'Designing Gypsy sites..' provides information that is allegedly based on fact,	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy. Finally I believe that a gypsy / traveller site at land at 459 Uttoxeter Road will cause undue pressure on the local schools, in particular the 3 local primary schools. If the proposed gypsy / traveller site is also likely to operate as a transit site and involve a continued turnover of families then the schools will also be impacted and disrupted by any gypsy / traveller children joining and leaving the classes part way through each of the term times.	
PO8978	Mr and Mrs John David and Susan Margaret Jackson		Object	Re: Sites TR002. Travellers site. [We] are writing to object to your proposed local draft plan and particularly site TR002 notably preferred traveller site at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge ST11 9NT. This land has been in the Jackson family since 1900 and was previously to that the home of [our] Great-great grandmother Sarah Bagnall. We wish to reiterate that under no circumstances are we prepared to sell our land the site at 459 Uttoxeter Road Blythe Bridge ST11 9NT for the use as a Travellers site. Furthermore SMDC claims that we have not ruled out allowing a travellers site and published in your consultation document and presented to the press is a complete fabrication and at no point have we ever agreed to allow a travellers site to be placed on our land. Also we object most strongly the claims voiced at Greatwood meeting and Cheadle Guild Hall by your planning officers and a District Councillor that we have sold you the land and that it is 95% passed. This is a gross misrepresentation and completely untrue. These comments have caused ourselves and our family much anguish and distress and smeared our name in the community. Our land that you have marked as TR002 is in the green belt and is therefore by our Governments policy not available for a	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council will consider all public responses to the Preferred Options consultation, including responses from landowners of sites. Sites must have landowner support to be deemed 'deliverable' to carry forward to Examination. the Council will have to reach a view regarding the number of outstanding traveller pitches it is required to provided for (as per its GTAA evidence), whether it is expedient to allocate a site(s); and if so the best location to do so. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify their allocation at Examination. The broad justification for the Council's

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4828				travellers site. Not only that, you have included in this site our own barn that you have recently allowed planning permission to convert to a two bedroom dwelling and which we hope to start very soon. This barn is to remain in our family as our retirement home as my husband has been very poorly. You have also included a large septic tank that services two homes, our current house and the house of our neighbours... The barn has it's own septic tank. You may also not be aware that there is no access to the sewer from this land and does not have facilities for caravans and the necessary utilities to service them. Further adding to the argument against this development is the fact that just over the street from this proposed preferred travellers site there is a grade 2 listed building built circa 1600 and as such it would be a travesty to think that the land can be used for such a purpose. In fact the whole area and some of the properties around is in the area known as Stonehouses and is an historic area. [Our] father and Grandfather and Great great grandmother were born in the grade 2 Stonehouse across the street that was in this family's ownership. We also consider that as there is already a development at Cresswell that has been approved for in excess of 160 homes and planned development to the extension of the business park there is no room for any further development to put added strain on the schools in Blythe Bridge, Tean and surrounding areas. Indeed the Primary school at Draycott is no longer there. There are no schools or any nearby services for the expansion of Cresswell so the already stretched services in Blythe Bridge will be expected to pull in the slack.	selection of 'preferred' sites over other sites, is site out in the 'Options Site Assessments' on the website. This includes consideration of heritage impacts, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, and the heritage impact recommendations of the most recent 2016 landscape impact study. All proposed sites must also be the subject of sustainability appraisal (the Council's S.A. will be published as part of its evidence base). • See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 SCC Highways comments for all preferred options, pre-suppose the allocation of all preferred options as set out in the 2016 consultation.
PO9121	Mr and Mrs W Marsden		Object	I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site(s) at location(s): TR008 75 Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge, and TR002 459 Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge also Land behind TR033 Chandni Cottage,	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Note only site TR002 is identified as a

Page 4829			Uttoxeter Road], as described in your planning proposal [title: Traveller and Gypsy Sites]. I am a property owner close to three of these sites. My primary reasons for objection are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the following policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following documents: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide DCLG (2012) Planning and policy for traveller sites SMDC (2014) Core Strategy Development Plan Document (pages 120-121) SMDC (2011) Gypsy and Traveller Site Options and Issues Appraisal Letter from SMDC to Frank Hopley.dated 23 February 2015, ref: DL/JF This document contains the following statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site at 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road Land behind Chandni Cottage, Uttoxeter Road is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, in particular: Relationship to surrounding land use 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. Response: The established community has made it overwhelmingly clear that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. The SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in	potential traveller allocation in the 2016 Preferred Options consultation. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval. • See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4830			particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. Response: The proposal for land to the west of 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road Land behind Chandni Cottage, Uttoxeter Road do not take noise into consideration, these are both residential areas, located within the existing settled community. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practise and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: Response: The proposed site at 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road is green belt land, therefore the proposal is NOT in accordance with existing planning policies. Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 1, item 4, bullet point 4: "that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development", Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 5, item 14: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development." There have been several previous declined planning applications (quote ref numbers) • Convenience for residents • Safety for residents Response : Traffic and proximity to railway line [detail comment on this point is dependent on location proposed] • Visual and acoustic privacy – both for people living on the site and those living nearby Response: See comment relating to point 4.14 below. In addition the settled community have heavily invested in property in these particular locations to ensure an enhanced degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location, a site at 75 Uttoxeter Road and	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4831			459Uttoxeter Road would destroy this privacy. • Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment Response: A traveller site at location 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road would in no way be in keeping with the local environment, [75 and 459 Uttoxeter Road] are both quiet residential areas comprising of a mix of late Victorian properties and mid 1930's semi-detached properties. • Scope for social integration with the local community. Response: NO evidence provided that substantiates the theory that the G&T community want social integration, in fact the opposite is the case (quote from Planning Policy doc ?????), in that the G&T community prefer an enclosed settlement on the edge of a rural setting. 4.14 As with housing for the settled community, site layout and design should ensure a degree of privacy for individual households. Response: any traveller accommodation at 75 Uttoxeter road would be overlooked by residents on either side, and from the elevated property directly opposite. Similar at 459 Uttoxeter Land behind Chandni Cottage, Uttoxeter Road + limited statement for Quabbs Ln? 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes could be up to around 25 metres in length. Response: Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site, high traffic volumes on Uttoxeter Road, often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at this75 Uttoxeter Road and 459Uttoxeter Road would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. 4.29 To increase potential access points for emergency vehicles, more than one access route into the site is recommended.	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4832			Where possible, site roads should be designed to allow two vehicles to pass each other (minimum 5.5m). Response: The existing track at Calverhay Farm (75 Uttoxeter Road) provides access to Network Rail engineers on a regular basis to the Caverswall sidings and cattle crossing (Stoke – Derby railway line). It is also a public footpath. The utilisation of this access route for traveller vehicles is not feasible and could result in obstruction of Network Rail vehicles. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas eg play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorised caravans. Response: This government ‘statement of fact’ re-enforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behaviour traits that the established community are very much concerned about. 5.32 The site should be designed so that post can be delivered separately for each pitch. Experience has shown that postal deliveries to pitches can be disrupted by complaints about harassment by dangerous dogs so the provision of an individual box at the entry to a pitch would be advisable. Response: This government ‘statement of fact’ based on past experiences with traveller sites highlights further problems that the established community are concerned about, the prospect of dangerous dogs roaming the proposed site at 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road is of grave concern, especially to the immediate neighbouring families with young children. Page 52 Evidence provided	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4833			to Select Committee “Gypsy and Traveller families often wish to have small compact and well-managed sites located in areas where they have historically resided and have a network of local family support. Response There is no evidence to suggest that there has been any gypsy family has historically resided at, or near the proposed site at 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road or Land behind Chandni Cottage, Uttoxeter Road . There is no evidence that local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites. Page 52: Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. + 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. Response: Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at these particular location 75 Uttoxeter Road and 459 Uttoxeter Road also Land behind Chandni Cottage, Uttoxeter Road. This information has not been provided. 10.18 As for other kinds of development, it is important that members of the local community, whether Gypsies and Travellers or settled residents, are able to feed in views on plans for new sites. Response: When will the detailed site plans be made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then this is surely a serious breach of government planning guidelines. 10.19 Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. Response: The government document ‘Designing Gypsy sites.’ Provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy (see points 5.36 and 5.32 from the above document). This map indicates the approximate locations of all sites originally identified within the Blythe Bridge area, back in 2015. Note that of the 7 possible sites, 3 are within 3/4 of a mile of the centre of Blythe Bridge and one is 1.4 miles away! It would seem that someone is determined to get the site located in this area, Staffordshire Moorlands comprises of 222 sq miles, so exactly why they have decided on such a concentration in and around Blythe Bridge deserves explanation. (Map showing location of Cresswell Station, Calverhay Farm/459 Uttoxeter Road/Quabbs Lane/Mobberley) I request that all of the above objections- and points within this objection document to be considered fully.	
PO9136	Mr and Mrs M Jackson		Object	I would like to strongly oppose the plans for a proposed traveler's site in Forsbrook on the plot next to Wards Fencing opposite Forsbrook cemetery for the reasons stated below:- * I believe it's green belt land therefore why are you building on it? I'm sure that there is plenty of other land elsewhere in the county or even better out of the county that isn't green belt land where the site could be placed. * My father is buried in Forsbrook cemetery which is directly opposite the site that you are proposing and I think it's beyond disrespectful, how would you feel if one of your parents was buried in the cemetery with a traveler's site across the road? I'm sure that many local people that have relatives buried in the cemetery feel the same about this, it's a thoughtless act with no care for the community that is already based in the village of Forsbrook and the surrounding area's. * The entrance/ exit to the cemetery is on a very busy road as it is which can be quite dangerous at times to increase the flow of traffic on this road would not only be	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 • See para response to PO58 about the Planning, Environmental Protection, and Public Health legislation All Planning Authorities are eligible to receive New Homes Bonus which was introduced by the Government to reflect and incentivise housing growth in their areas. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new homes and is payable annually over a 6 year period.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4835			dangerous but also a careless act. * I often walk to the cemetery from my house and I have seen alot of wildlife such as hedgehogs in the field this would all be disrupted when surely it's supposed to be protected on green belt land? * Not to tarnish all travelers with the same brush BUT I work at Keele University and they have a permanent traveler's site down the road, many times I have seen children running around the roundabout and across the roads when they should be at school. There is rubbish all around the entrance to the site and it generally has a very untidy look about it. Dogs are also often roaming freely and I have seen them messing on the pavements around the edge of the site and nobody has cleaned this up. The clientele of the people going in and out of the site also leaves alot to be desired. We do not want this in our village, Forsbrook is a lovely place to live ..[redacted].. * If the traveler's site was to be approved on this plot it would without a shadow of a doubt decrease the value of our property, at present property in Forsbrook is desirable and generally sells very quickly however this would not be the case if the traveler's site was to be approved. It would massively affect our property prices, my husband and I work very hard to maintain our property to keep/increase it's value as I'm sure that many people do in the village. If the traveler's site was approved nobody would want to buy property in Forsbrook particularly where I live because it is so close to the site and let's be honest would you because I wouldn't? This is most disheartening after we have worked so hard to purchase our house. It seems to me and my husband and to many of the local residents that you have put no thought into how your proposed plans for both the traveler's site and the housing development will affect the residents of Forsbrook, many of which have lived in the village all of	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				their lives. Your plans are thoughtless and your actions are careless and this all seems as though it's a money making scheme for the council with no thought as to how this will impact the residents.	
PO9139	Mr Mat Turner		Object	I have recently heard of the proposed traveller sight on uttoxeter road Blythe Bridge and I wish to express my opposition to this plan. I am unsure of any formal way to stress this issue and I have been told to contact this email. I live at 39 Highfield close, Blythe Bridge, just across from the purposed site. In the mean time please except this email as my official opposition to the proposed traveller site at 75 uttoxeter road and 459 uttoxeter road.	Comments noted.
PO9152	Mrs Pam Thompson		Object	I am notifying you of my objection to your proposed traveller site at 459 Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge. My primary objection is that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of Government guidelines. My front door is approximately 400yds from this proposed site, it may be behind a large hedge but it's still there. ..[redacted].. We already have the A50 completely blocking one side of our village, with lorries "tipping" over regularly and disrupting traffic flow, increasing noise level and reducing safety for our children. Please don't further pick on us and force community cohesion on us. Travellers are proven to have commercial vehicles coming and going all times of the day and night. Please reconsider your proposal to a site outside the Green Belt and away from a happy and traditional English Village.	• See response to PO871 • See response to PO13
PO9153	Zoe Degg		Object	Hi we are currently doing a house up in Blythe bridge making it our family home. We chose Blythe bridge for the lovely setting that it's in. The green belt land should stay. So I oppose to the site.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. In the case of sites within the Green belt (such as here) the Council would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

					justify their allocation at Examination.
PO9606			Object	Letter objecting to Preferred Options sites TR002, and BB041 submitted [attached]. This also attaches letter to Bill Cash MP regarding TR002: improper use of Green Belt land – incongruous to local community; we should be preserving views, wildlife. Existing Council owner brownfield sites should be used instead	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 • See response to PO871
PO9607			Object	Letter objecting to Preferred Options sites TR002 and BB041 (and attaching correspondence to Bill Cash MP) submitted [attached]:	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 • See response to PO871
PO9511	Mr Chris Stevenson		Object	Summary of representation (full representation attached). My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller Site at TR002 are as follows: SMDC proposal is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines. The established community is clear (petition and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Noise has not been taken into consideration. This is a residential area and commercial vehicles will be entering and leaving the site at all hours. Traffic – the site faces a high speed road and there is insufficient space to allow vehicles safe egress. Privacy would be destroyed. Would not be inkeeping with the local environment which is a quiet residential area comprising victorian and mid-1930s properties. No evidence provided that the G&T community want social integration. Traveller accommodation would be overlooked. Regular movement of large slow vehicles would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Fear of problems associated with some traveller sites. No evidence of gypsy families residing in the vicinity of the site. No evidence of need at this particular location. Information should be based on fact and openly publicised.	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162
PO9536	Mr P Thys		Object	Summary of representation (representation attached). My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller Site	• See response to PO9123

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4838				at TR002 are as follows: SMDC proposal is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines. The established community is clear (petition and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Noise has not been taken into consideration. This is a residential area and commercial vehicles will be entering and leaving the site at all hours. Traffic – the site faces a high speed road and there is insufficient space to allow vehicles safe egress. Privacy would be destroyed. Would not be inkeeping with the local environment which is a quiet residential area comprising victorian and mid-1930s properties. No evidence provided that the G&T community want social integration. Traveller accommodation would be overlooked. Regular movement of large slow vehicles would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Fear of problems associated with some traveller sites. No evidence of gypsy families residing in the vicinity of the site. No evidence of need at this particular location. Information should be based on fact and openly publicised.	See response to PO9162
	PO9171	Gillian Armstrong	Object	I wish to object most strongly to the above-mentioned proposed Gypsy site. This is right on the edge of what is currently a very pleasant, relatively crime-free place to live. Surely there must be more suitable sites, away from residential areas, and not on green belt land. ..[redacted]... We do not want this in Blythe Bridge. PLEASE RECONSIDER!	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council formulated a series of options sites for traveller allocation, which appear on the website. These were the subject of sustainability appraisal, which considered road links, access to facilities etc. This assisted the Council in its decisionmaking with regards TR002.
	PO9452	Ms Julie Lyons	Object	I am replying to the recent release of the preferred option for a travellers site in Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. At the last Parish meeting it was stated that the owner of the land marked as site T002, didn't	See reponse to PO8978

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				wish to sell the land to for this purpose. This information was also discussed at a Parish meeting in late 2015. I have now been informed (6 th June) that this option has now been deleted from any further consultation. I have looked at your traveller site plans, which are flagged with the owners preference as not known or owner unknown. I think it is really remiss of the Council at this late stage to have not investigated further and a very least been aware of owners views before publishing the plans. The subject of Traveller Sites are very emotive and this alone has caused the local community stress, anxiety and anger. SMDC should have done more to have limited the damage to the community it serves.	
PO9505	Mrs Rosemary Henson		Object	I grew up on the above property which has been named as a potential traveller site and still regularly visit my parents, more so since my fathers stroke last year. Since this proposal it has greatly distressed both my parents, myself, my husband and my siblings, particularly my father, who's family has resided in Blythe Bridge as far back as we can remember. In our opinion to use this land as a traveller site would have absolutely no benefit to the village, local community and the surrounding houses of whom it equally distresses. Not only this but some day we hope to inherit this property and surrounding countryside, home to many indigenous species of birds and wildlife. Not to mention two ponds which were put there by my father, home to many fish and wildlife of which would be greatly affected by the invasion of people. Sentimental value aside, this land is most importantly within green belt, and as such has been used for agricultural purposes only and should not under any circumstances be used for anything other than farm land. It is not on the local sewer, the two current properties and the barn with granted planning permission share a septic tank only of which has been	• See reponse to PO8978 • See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4840				paid for by the properties that share it. Until recently my parents house was of the last in the village, but we now have direct neighbours to consider and the possibility of future neighbours in the adjacent barn, of which has even been included within the proposed gypsy site. My parents have plans to move to this barn, as my father is unable to use the stairs and there has been absolutely no consideration to this in the plans of TR002. It is outrageous that the land he has lived on all his life and his future retirement home will be in the centre of a travellers site. I ask you, would you place your disabled father and mother in the centre of a traveller site? I imagine you would say no. Further more, I find it an insult that my parents name has been dragged through the dirt. Local village people are under the assumption, thanks to false journalism, that my parents wish to go ahead with plans for the traveller site. This is false and we wish to clear our name. The green belt is there to preserve what remains of countryside in this country. Having lived in the city of Manchester I have seen first hand what housing expansion and further settlers can do to an already congested area. We should protect our green belt land. We do not have the infrastructure or local facilities here to support additional settlers. There is no longer a public school in the area Draycott and the A50 is already a very congested road, having first hand witnessed the countless road collisions on the bypass. Not to mention the additional houses being built at Cresswell and expanding business park, all of which will have to accommodate at our local schools and roads. I feel very strongly about my objection to these plans and will support my family and the local community to oppose this decision.	
PO9468	Linda Washington		Object	We would like to register our objections to the proposal for traveller sites in Blythe Bridge/Forsbrook. We would	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4841	and Robert Brough			like to object to all the sites but in particular we object very strongly to the following two sites: (TR002 and TR015). TR002. 459 Uttoxeter Road. This proposed site leads onto a busy dual carriageway with a national speed limit. Slow moving and turning vehicles towing caravans can only be a hazard. Close to the site is a doctors surgery and behind the surgery is a sports field. How long would it be before the travellers on the proposed site saw this and told others. The field/doctors has a flimsy barrier that could easily be removed. It could end up being used illegally and tax payers having to foot the bill for the clean up. This does happen. Our general concerns are personal. ..[redacted].. The area would become somewhere people wanted to get out of rather than move to. Why are all the proposed sites in this area, Staffs moorlands covers 222 square miles so why all the proposed sites in one area? The Blythe Bridge sites are all close to the A50. When there is a problem on the A50, which happens frequently, Blythe Bridge and surrounding areas become gridlocked. Blythe Bridge is constantly busy with traffic and we do not need any more.	Note only site TR002 is identified as a potential traveller allocation in the 2016 Preferred Options consultation. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval. • See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162
	PO9470 Mrs Sarah Tinsley		Object	I must object in the strongest terms to the preferred travellers site TR002 in Blythe Bridge. This land adjoins my grazing paddocks and I fear for the security of my livestock and property if this was to go ahead knowing that many travellers have a multitude of dogs as well as ponies that they graze by the roadside. Additionally, I know that [the owners] have informed Staffordshire Moorlands Council that they will not sell their land for a travellers site. This position is not documented in the public consultation and appears to have been completely ignored in the council assessments.	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. • See reponse to PO8978
	PO9593 Mrs A Appleby		Object	Letter submitted [attached] objecting to Preferred Options traveller site at Blythe Bridge: site included in	• See reponse to PO8978

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				consultation proposals despite numerous contacts from owner that site not available for this use question why seven of the traveller site options were located within 2 mile radius of Blythe Bridge, when rest of District available; and brownfield possibilities elsewhere, eg Stoke on Trent Blythe Bridge/Blythe Marsh has outstanding open countryside quotes relevant policies from Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, arguing site not suitable (in Green Belt/ no mains drains/site elevated and enclosed/ pressure on local services etc)	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Note only site TR002 is identified as a potential traveller allocation in the 2016 Preferred Options consultation. Every future stage of the emerging Local Plan must be subject to full public consultation, and Council Assembly approval.
PO9522	Mr K Tunnicliffe		Object	Summary of representation (representation attached). My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller Site at TR002 are as follows: SMDC proposal is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines. The established community is clear (petition and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Noise has not been taken into consideration. This is a residential area and commercial vehicles will be entering and leaving the site at all hours. Traffic – the site faces a high speed road and there is insufficient space to allow vehicles safe egress. Privacy would be destroyed. Would not be inkeeping with the local environment which is a quiet residential area comprising victorian and mid-1930s properties. No evidence provided that the G&T community want social integration. Traveller accommodation would be overlooked. Regular movement of large slow vehicles would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Fear of problems associated with some traveller sites. No evidence of gypsy families residing in the vicinity of the site. No evidence of need at this particular location. Information should be based on fact and openly publicised.	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162
PO9532	Mr C Salt		Object	Summary of representation (representation attached).	• See response to PO9123

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4843				My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller Site at TR002 are as follows: SMDC proposal is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines. The established community is clear (petition and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Noise has not been taken into consideration. This is a residential area and commercial vehicles will be entering and leaving the site at all hours. Traffic – the site faces a high speed road and there is insufficient space to allow vehicles safe egress. Privacy would be destroyed. Would not be inkeeping with the local environment which is a quiet residential area comprising victorian and mid-1930s properties. No evidence provided that the G&T community want social integration. Traveller accommodation would be overlooked. Regular movement of large slow vehicles would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Fear of problems associated with some traveller sites. No evidence of gypsy families residing in the vicinity of the site. No evidence of need at this particular location. Information should be based on fact and openly publicised.	• See response to PO9162
PO9608	Mrs K Robertson		Object	Letter objecting to Preferred Options sites TR002, and BB041 (correspondence sent to Bill Cash MP attached): improper use of Green Belt – using this land would be incongruous; we should be preserving views/wildlife; existing Council-owned brownfield sites should be used instead. Proximity of gypsy site – understand that the Gypsy Council have already met with SMDC (said they are NOT to be sited next to houses or too close to local communities); most residents agree with this. So question why TR002 being proposed. Other more appropriate sites – question why Council have selected TR002 over Checkley site option (when latter site scored more 'pluses' [on published sustainability	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 • See response to PO8254 Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4844				appraisal]). Traffic issues – volume of traffic already a concern, and will get worse with additional Cheadle, Alton traffic. Cheadle Road is only local through road. Village cannot cope with extra gypsy traffic (such as large vehicles). Therefore increased noise/pollution/congestion/traffic accidents. Strain on public services – local dentists/doctors/schools already full. Wildlife – propose that site be inspected for protected wildlife, before proceeding further. Land cost – time of austerity – abhorrent you are considering purchasing green belt sites. Use Council-owned brownfield sites first. Blight – if you use green belt land inappropriately and it impinges on the rights, well being and values of the local houses, this will cause distress to villagers, and house valuations/ability to sell houses. Council will be responsible for subsequent blight. Argues that that site TR008 is in breach of DCLG Best Practice Traveller Guidance on numerous grounds. Alternative suggestion is that a traveller site should be sited away from villages but within 2 miles of them, eg Checkley, Mobberley. Question why most traveller site options are around Blythe Bridge – should widen search to look at all SMD starting with brownfield sites away from villages. Both the gypsies and local community would be happy with this; would create cultural cohesion. Letter to Bill Cash, re-iterating objections to TR002 and BB041.	
PO9458	Mrs P Marsden		Object	With the overview of all the linked sites named above,(Northern Gateway Site/Proposed Traveller Site/BB041/OC055) I wish to draw your attention to the following information from The World Health Organisation website, where the full document is available for your perusal: (http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/pr221_E.pdf 1st June 2016) Lyon/Geneva, 17 October 2013 – The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the	Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council consults internally with its own Environmental Health Team and they did not raise objections to either site TR002, or site OC055, (subject to appropriate conditions). Note all proposed major developments are required to have their

Page 4845			International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, the world's leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). The IARC evaluation showed an increasing risk of lung cancer with increasing levels of exposure to particulate matter and air pollution. Although the composition of air pollution and levels of exposure can vary dramatically between locations, the conclusions of the Working Group apply to all regions of the world. It is therefore immediately apparent that increased air pollution created from the higher volume of traffic generated from ALL of the above sites will be a source of concern to the health and wellbeing of residents. If the proposals go ahead the identity of Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell will be changed beyond recognition from small hamlets and a village to an extension and continuation of the urban sprawl of Stoke on Trent. Many of my neighbours I have discussed this matter with, purchased our properties and chose to live in the area because it is a non estate location, rural, with few houses and lots of green space. Therefore our views must be taken into consideration, when any major changes to the area in which we reside and pay council tax for are considered. Clearly this was not the case with the Blythe Park expansion, which will cause the volume of traffic on Cresswell Lane and Uttoxeter Road, Draycott to greatly increase the number	potential environmental impacts assessed prior to the granting of planning permission. The Council consults with SCC Highways/SCC Transportation during Local Plan preparation. SCC did not raise any objections to development of TR002 for traveller use subject to junction assessments; local pedestrian and cycle links will also require consideration. In the event of future planning applications the Council would assess schemes having significant transport impacts against relevant NPPF and Local Plan policy (including requirement to submit transport statements, and provide highways improvements where deemed appropriate). • See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 The reasons for the distribution of development across the District are set out in the Spatial Strategy policies of the Local Plan.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4846			of vehicles on an already very busy road-also used as a diversion for the frequent A50 closures. The vibration from this traffic has already caused damage to garden walls and with some HGV's you can feel the vibration through the house. My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller site at TR002 are listed in detail below: The TR002 proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the following policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following document: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following numbered statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller site at TR002 is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, as follows: 3.8 Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. Response: The established community has made it overwhelmingly clear (by over 400 petition votes and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. The SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. Response: The proposal for TR002 does not take noise into consideration, this is a residential area, located within the existing settled	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4847			community. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practice and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: • Convenience for residents • Safety for residents Response: Traffic, this site is located facing a high speed road, there is insufficient acceleration space to allow slow moving vehicles safe egress. • Visual and acoustic privacy – both for people living on the site and those living nearby Response: See comment relating to point 4.14 below. In addition the settled community have heavily invested in property in these particular locations to ensure an enhanced degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location, a site at TR002 would destroy this privacy. • Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment Response: A traveller site at location TR002 would in no way be in keeping with the local environment, this is a quiet residential areas comprising of a mix of late Victorian properties and mid 1930's semi-detached properties. • Scope for social integration with the local community. Response: NO evidence provided that substantiates the theory that the G&T community want social integration, in fact the opposite is the case (according to Planning Policy documents), in that the Gypsy and Traveller community prefer an enclosed settlement on the edge of a rural setting. 4.14 As with housing for the settled community, site layout and design should ensure a degree of privacy for individual households. Response: any traveller accommodation at TR002 would be overlooked by residents on one side, and from the elevated property directly opposite. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4848			Traveller communities to favor the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes could be up to around 25 metres in length. Response: Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site, high traffic volumes on the A521 Uttoxeter Road, often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at this location would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas eg play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorized caravans. Response: This government 'statement of fact' re-enforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behavior traits that the established community are very much concerned about. 5.32 The site should be designed so that post can be delivered separately for each pitch. Experience has shown that postal deliveries to pitches can be disrupted by complaints about harassment by dangerous dogs so the provision of an individual box at the entry to a pitch would be advisable. Response: This government 'statement of fact' based on past experiences with traveller sites highlights further problems that the established community are concerned about, the prospect of dangerous dogs roaming the proposed site at TR002 is of grave concern, especially to the immediate neighboring families with young children. Page 52: Evidence provided to Select Committee	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4849			“Gypsy and Traveller families often wish to have small compact and well-managed sites located in areas where they have historically resided and have a network of local family support. Response: There is no evidence to suggest that there has been any gypsy family has historically resided at, or near the proposed site at TR002. There is no evidence that local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites. Page 52 : Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. Response: Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at this particular location TR002. This information has not been provided. 10.19: Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. Response: The government document ‘Designing Gypsy sites’ provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicized in official documentation and policy (see points 4.36 and 5.32 from the above document). I cannot stress enough that the proposed siting of these developments, in particular TR002 are particularly ill-considered, Yet again another ‘steamroller’ tactic of SMDC to push all developments that are unwanted in other parts of the SMDC district into small hamlets, primarily inhabited by retired persons who do not have internet access and are therefore clearly deemed a soft target. My neighbor has spoken to residents groups in Leek who say they would welcome	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				industrial parks and associated housing as they want to offer 'local jobs' to help with the ongoing, very successful regeneration of Leek . No one from SMDC has yet explained why no developments of the size planned for Blythe Bridge, Draycott and Cresswell have been proposed for Leek. No one from SMDC has explained why almost 80% of the district allocation for housing and industrial parks is being sited at Cresswell, Draycott and Blythe Bridge. No one from SMDC has explained why there is no allocation for a Traveller Site at Leek, there is clearly a demand for this, as unofficial traveller sites and occupation of land from the travelling community is not uncommon in Leek. I request that all of the above objections- and points within this objection document to be considered fully.	
Page 4850 PO9467	Ms Nicola Davis		Object	I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed traveller site(s) in and around Blythe Bridge area as described in your planning proposal. My primary reasons for objection are that this proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the following policies, government guidelines and previous statements made by the SMDC on this matter. In particular I shall be referring to the following documents: DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide DCLG (2012) Planning and policy for traveller sites SMDC (2014) Core Strategy Development Plan Document (pages 120-121) SMDC (2011) Gypsy and Traveller Site Options and Issues Appraisal Letter from SMDC to Frank Hopley. Dated 23 February 2015, ref: DL/JF DCLG (2008) Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide This document contains the following statements which indicate that the SMDC proposal for a traveller sites in and around Blythe Bridge is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines, in particular: Relationship to surrounding land use 3.8	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4851			Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. For this purpose it is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them. Response: The established community has made it overwhelmingly clear that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. The SMDC has not been active in promoting any broader strategies to improve community cohesion. 3.9 The site must be sustainable, offering scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community. This will include consideration of noise and possible disturbance to Gypsy and Travellers living on the site, and possible noise and disturbance to the wider community, in particular from movement of Gypsy and Traveller vehicles. Response: The proposal for land to the west of 75 Uttoxeter Road and 491 Uttoxeter Road do not take noise into consideration, these are both residential areas, located within the existing settled community. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time, as is common practise and can be witnessed at other traveller sites within the Staffordshire area. In addition to this there is also the impact on the community with increased traffic, the roads in and around Blythe Bridge are busy at all times of the day and night and increasing this with constant increase in vehicular traffic would increase the noise pollution in the surrounding areas as well as increasing the incidence of accidents for the numerous children in and around these areas at peak times. 4.1 Sites should be developed in accordance with existing planning policies and designations, with particular regard made to: Response: The proposed sites in Blythe Bridge are is green belt	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4852			land, therefore the proposal is NOT in accordance with existing planning policies. Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 1, item 4, bullet point 4: "that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development", Ref: DCLG Planning and Policy for traveller sites 2012, page 5, item 14: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development." There have been several previous declined planning applications (quote ref numbers) • Convenience for residents • Safety for residents • Visual and acoustic privacy – both for people living on the site and those living nearby Response: See comment relating to point 4.14 below. In addition the settled community have heavily invested in property in these particular locations to ensure an enhanced degree of privacy due to the semi-rural location, both proposed sites in Blythe Bridge would destroy this privacy. • Aesthetic compatibility with the local environment Response: A traveller site at these locations would in no way be in keeping with the local environment, are quiet residential areas comprising of a mix of late Victorian properties and mid 1930's semi-detached properties. 4.17 Account needs to be taken of a more recent tendency for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities to favour the use of a mobile home in place of the traditional caravan, and some mobile homes could be up to around 25 metres in length. Response: Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site, high traffic volumes on Uttoxeter Road, often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at this location would introduce a	

Page 4853			substantial safety risk to road users. These are areas of heavy congestion through the daytime and at peak times often leading to disruption, in addition to the increased incidence of injuries, there are three schools in this vicinity plus two supermarkets whose traffic causes issues throughout the day. 4.29 To increase potential access points for emergency vehicles, more than one access route into the site is recommended. Where possible, site roads should be designed to allow two vehicles to pass each other (minimum 5.5m). Response: The existing track at Calverhay Farm (75 Uttoxeter Road) provides access to Network Rail engineers on a regular basis to the Caverswall sidings and cattle crossing (Stoke – Derby railway line). It is also a public footpath. The utilisation of this access route for traveller vehicles is not feasible and could result in obstruction of Network Rail vehicles. 4.36 To avoid disputes and provide defensible space, it is important to provide clear delineation of public communal areas eg play areas and private space, with boundaries that indicate clearly where individual pitches begin and end. It is recommended that communal areas without a clear usage are avoided in the design as they may attract vandalism, fly tipping or unauthorised caravans. Response: This government ‘statement of fact’ re-enforces the fear that a degree of unlawful activity can be associated with some traveller sites, this does nothing to ensure community cohesion as it outlines particular behaviour traits that the established community are very much concerned about. Page 52 Evidence provided to Select Committee “Gypsy and Traveller families often wish to have small compact and well-managed sites located in areas where they have historically resided and have a network of local family support. Response There is no evidence to suggest that	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4854			there has been any gypsy family has historically resided at , or near the proposed sites in and around Blythe Bridge. There is no evidence that local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites. Page 52: Caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area. + 10.20 It will be important to demonstrate the need for new site provision in any consultation with the settled community, and the steps that the council or private developer will take to address concerns and deal with problems should they arise. Response: Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at these locations. 10.18 As for other kinds of development, it is important that members of the local community, whether Gypsies and Travellers or settled residents, are able to feed in views on plans for new sites. Response When will the detailed site plans be made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then this is surely a serious breach of government planning guidelines. 10.19 Councils and other developers need to plan for the possibility of such opposition at an early stage in the development and provide accurate information to help overturn negative stereotypes and allay concerns. Response: The government document 'Designing Gypsy sites..' provides information that is allegedly based on fact, negative stereotyping is of little concern if the true negative aspects are openly publicised in official documentation and policy (see points 5.36 and 5.32 from the above document). I trust these views and others shared by residents of the villages will be considered, Greenbelt areas are a necessary area in a rural environment, and a proposal to build albeit "temporary" structures is a complete disregard of the nature of these areas, The Staffordshire moorlands district covers in excess of 200square miles	

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				and within this a number of brownfield sites with better access to services that the current proposed sites. Surely in line with the governments environmental commitments areas such as these should be developed if they are indeed necessary for these groups.	
PO9494	Victoria Stephenson		Object	The access directly onto the dual carriageway at that point would not be safe for caravans or other large vehicles, it is an accident waiting to happen. And children, horses, dogs would be straight out onto an extremely busy dual carriageway. There would be no privacy at this site for the travellers nor those who neighbour them. Also that land has been used for landfill in the past and is contaminated ground, making it completely unfair to expect the travelling people to live, let their children play, keep their pets/livestock on it. Quite aside from anything else, [the owner] has declared repeatedly, and has put in writing several times to state that she is not willing to sell the land for this purpose. We were told at the residents' development meeting that forced purchase cannot be made, yet it seems that planning permission is still going ahead.	• See response to PO013 Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. The Council consults internally with its own Environmental Health Team and they did not raise objections to this site, subject to appropriate conditions. • See response to PO8978
PO9503	Rebekah Wilbur		Object	I grew up on the above property which has been named as a potential traveller site. It has always been the intention of my parents to pass this land on to their children, as it has been within our family for several generations and holds both great personal and sentimental value to us. In the 20 years I and my siblings have lived at this address, this land has remained within green belt, and as such has been used for agricultural purposes only. My parents have resided in Blythe Bridge their whole lives. They have been hard working, honest and caring members of this community. They have worked hard to service the local people, community and economy. I find it incredulous that this is the only named potential site deemed	• See response to PO8978 • See response to PO9162 Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 4856				adequate to house travellers in over 220 parishes. This decision is unfair to not only the owners of this property but also the village in which it resides. My parents and the land they own are being held to ransom; their good name is being publicly tarnished by the misinformation circulating among the general public about the sale of this land. Having lived in Blythe Bridge for most of my life, it concerns me that we are potentially subjecting long standing home-owners to the problems associated with such a site..[redacted]..; along with the possibility of more travellers settling illegally on unauthorized or public land, which has been the case in other communities and villages throughout the country. In fact there have been land-mark court rulings in recent years, protecting villages from illegal camping and traveller sites. Long fought and hard won court battles, backed by entire communities of people. It is my opinion that the sale of this land is NOT in the best interest of our community and I am confident that the community of Blythe Bridge won't stand for an imposed or mandated traveler site. Having spoken to my parents, in great depth, on this matter, they have serious objections to the sale and use of this land as a traveller site. As their daughter, I strongly object to this land being used as a traveller site and have informed my parents that I object to the sale of any of this land. My siblings have taken similar measures. I can assure you, we, as a family have no intentions to sell this land at all, for any purpose. I am in full support of my parents taking any precautionary measures or legal action deemed necessary to prevent this land becoming a traveller site.	
PO9535	Mrs M Thys		Object	Summary of representation (representation attached). My primary reasons for my objection to a Traveller Site at TR002 are as follows: SMDC proposal is in breach of the 2008 good practice guidelines. The established	• See response to PO9123 • See response to PO9162 Note that site TR002 has been removed

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

Page 1857				community is clear (petition and attendance at public meetings) that they do not want community cohesion forced upon them. Noise has not been taken into consideration. This is a residential area and commercial vehicles will be entering and leaving the site at all hours. Traffic - the site faces a high speed road and there is insufficient space to allow vehicles safe egress. Privacy would be destroyed. Would not be inkeeping with the local environment which is a quiet residential area comprising victorian and mid-1930s properties. No evidence provided that the G&T community want social integration. Traveller accommodation would be overlooked. Regular movement of large slow vehicles would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users. Fear of problems associated with some traveller sites. No evidence of gypsy families residing in the vicinity of the site. No evidence of need at this particular location. Information should be based on fact and openly publicised.	from the emerging Local Plan.
	PO9950	Ms E Malbon	Object	- I would like to register my objections to the proposed Travellers Site in Blythe Bridge on Mr Jackson's land. My reasons are:- 1) All the local schools are full to capacity with classes of 36 or more children, how can they cope with more and educated t	• See response to PO9123 Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan.
	PO1463	Ms Jane Wheat	Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
	PO1453	Mr Albert Hodgetts	Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
	PO1454	Mrs Dorothy Hodgetts	Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
	PO1446	Ms Julie Whitehall	Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the	Comments noted.

Question 40 Do you have any comments on the travellers site?

				suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	• See response to PO9123
PO1448	Mr Bernard Hawe		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO1447	Ms Sheila Hawe		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO1450	Mr E G Clewlow		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO1457	Mr and Mrs R Clapcott		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO1459	Mr A Bentley		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO1460	Mr M A Shingler		Support	I also wish to support the proposal of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road network.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO9604	Mr and Mrs Day Elks		Support	Response letter: I also wish to support the identification of the Moorlands District allocated traveller site at Blythe Bridge due to the suitability of the infrastructure of the road networks.	Comments noted. • See response to PO9123
PO9668	Brenda Matthews		Support	(Summarised) Support for proposed Travellers site at Blythe Bridge however concerned about security of adjacent land which houses stables (and horses) due to the location of the site Ask to consider moving the green belt boundary so it would allow us to put in a planning application for a 3 bedroom house within the curtilage of our stable block to allow us to be close to our horses. (Maps attached - showing location).	Comments noted. Note that site TR002 has been removed from the emerging Local Plan. Schemes arising within the Green Belt would be assessed on a case by case basis against national policy, in particular paragraphs 87-90 NPPF.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO265	mr anthony williamson				Object	I feel strongly that all of these extra houses being built in rural areas will destroy the local communities and put immense strain on local services. It is not needed and there are plenty of brown field land that could be used.	- New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure/local facilities e.g. more residents may support more local facilities, shops and services. Some infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. - National planning guidance states that the Council should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the infrastructure necessary to support the Local Plan proposals. It builds on the findings of the Development Capacity Study for the Core Strategy. Consultation and work with infrastructure providers is ongoing and their feedback will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan. The Council is working with the Staffordshire County Council to assess the impact proposed development on school capacity, what additional capacity is needed and how this can be delivered. - Site allocations are required to meet the District's proposed housing requirement. There is not enough brownfield land or sites or infill sites in settlements to meet the District's proposed housing requirements so green field sites need to be included. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan
PO1071	Mr Stuart Davies				Object	Most if not all villages in the Staffordshire Moorlands are large enough as they are and have developed infrastructure to support them. Future developments should either be limited to infill.	See response to PO265
PO2698	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			Object	There is no commentary around the issue of flood risk and how the sites have been chosen with the Sequential process in mind. However, we do note that the sites we previously identified as being the most severely impacted due to flood risk, have not been taken forward to this stage, which we welcome. We have however, identified some sites where further work is necessary and we wish to remind the Local Planning Authority that Sequential Test evidence should be provided and reiterate if these sites are to be taken forward, then a Level 2 SFRA should also be undertaken. At this Preferred Options stage, this work should already be done. However, there is one final chance for this to be undertaken, prior to the Publication Draft towards the end of this year. If it is not done by that stage, the Site Allocation Document risks being found unsound as it will be at odds with the guidance set out in the SFRA Level 1 and potentially, Flood Risk policies that will be set out in the next consultation.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency regarding the Local Plan. There is a specific policy regarding flood risk and where appropriate the individual site policies reference flood risk issues.

Others

Question 41 – Do you have any other comments regarding the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO2791	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	BB040: According to information held by the Environment Agency these sites are located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	Site was not proposed for allocation in the consultation
PO2794	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	BB087: According to information held by the Environment Agency these sites are located above historic landfill sites. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	See above
PO2804	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	IP014a: According to information held by the Environment Agency this site is located above a historic landfill site. The local council, as lead regulator for these sites, should be contacted for further information.	See above
PO2805	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	KG024: This site appears to be Brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	See above
PO2819	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	RS007: This site is located within Source Protection Zone 2. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place on this site (e.g. in relation to the storage of hazardous substances and drainage arrangements).	See above
PO2820	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	RS009: This site is located within Source Protection Zone 2. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place on this site (e.g. in relation to the storage of hazardous substances and drainage arrangements).	See above
PO2821	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	RS015: This site is located within Source Protection Zone 2. In line with the position statements in our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' document (available from our website at www.gov.uk/environment-agency), there would be restrictions on the activities that can take place on this site (e.g. in relation to the storage of hazardous substances and drainage arrangements).	See above
PO2823	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	UT011: This site appears to be Brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	See above
PO2825	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	UT014: This site appears to be Brownfield. Although it is unlikely that the issue of Brownfield Land will make any of the allocations undevelopable due to cost/constraint, sites within the Source Protection Zones and flagged up, will be subject to certain restrictions.	See above
PO2834	Mr Martin Ross	Environment Agency			General comment	The appropriate level and detail of ecological appraisal should be provided for any developments going forward on the	See above

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						proposed site allocations. These should be completed to CIEEM guidelines namely to identify and evaluate the ecological features of interest and potential impacts upon them. The mitigation hierarchy should be employed from the outset of any design and development planning to avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset impacts, both direct and indirect. Many proposed allocations are adjacent to priority habitats and statutory and non-statutory designated sites, including watercourses. In line with the mitigation hierarchy and relevant NPPF sections, i.e. 109, every effort should be made to re-naturalize watercourses, including de-culverting where technically feasible. The main impact on any sites from a developable point of view, are easements from watercourses to help promote Green and Blue corridors and networks where migration and movement along the watercourse banks can occur. This is likely to be between 5 metres, up to 10 metres on some main river stretches. Impacts on water quality need to be assessed, particularly the cumulative impact to ensure the relevant WFD waterbodies do not deteriorate in status and listed measures in the RBMP are taken into account. Collective contributions from specific areas could be used to support innovative land management schemes upstream in the catchment delivering natural flood management to reduce flood risk in the new developments and wider communities downstream. We would recommend and welcome the opportunity to comment on pre-applications to ensure the best opportunities and outcomes are realised.	
PO2581	Consultation Service	Natural England			General comment	With regard to baseline data and additional new sites : The Council may need to check that up to date information on local wildlife sites (Sites of Biological Interest and Biodiversity Alert Sites in Staffordshire) has been referenced when identifying preferred sites. Our previous advice letter dated 14.9.15 gave detailed advice on themes and issues including these non-statutory sites. Natural England no longer has access to this dataset and the as the preferred sites consultation includes a number of additional sites (not considered as part of last year's consultation) the Council will need to access up to date information to check on any impacts on these sites. Please contact the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (01889 880 100 or email info@staffswt.org.uk) for further information if you do not hold the relevant dataset in house.	Comments noted
PO2629	Consultation Service	Natural England			Support	Natural England welcomes the deletion of those site options described in our advice letter dated 14.9.15 where selection would involve the expansion of the village closer to the Wetley Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), to within 150m of the SSSI at the closest point. Those sites are: WE019 WE040 WE041 This deletion of these site options is consistent with NPPF para 118 and adopted local plan policies including DC1 Design Considerations and NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources.	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
PO4467	Mr Matthew Stafford	Co-operative Group Limited (COOP)			Object	Letter, map, and 3x corresponding response forms submitted [relating to Questions 34/37/38] which object to Fole not having been identified in the Preferred Options, as a 'smaller village' with an infill boundary, pursuant to Core Strategy Policies; and that this should be corrected in forthcoming review of these policies. A map attachment of Fole is submitted to showing what is argued should constitute this new boundary - including the 2014 Fole Dairy mixed housing/ employment planning permission, and some other buildings. It is also argued that the new Local Plan proposals maps should identify the respective housing and employment areas already approved at Fole dairy, as housing and employment commitments. [Refer to letter, map and 3x form attachments].	The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the Local Plan.
PO1308	Ms Melanie Lindsley	The Coal Authority			General comment	(Summary - please see attached file for full version) As you will be aware, the Staffordshire Moorlands area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting to approximately 22.07 of the Council area. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. The area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. Within the Plan area there are approximately 1,225 recorded mine entries and around 205 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. A range of other mining legacy features are present, in total The Coal Authority High Risk Development Area covers approximately 6.98% of the Council area. Mining legacy is concentrated in and around the Towns of Biddulph and Cheadle and many of the villages south-west of the A523. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. No development should take place over mine entries even when treated. Although mining legacy occurs as a result	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with the Coal Authority. Consideration has been given to mining legacy issues and where appropriate there are site specific policies

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. In our previous response on the 14 September 2015 we stated: "In assessing potential site allocations, it would therefore be prudent to include a criterion which assesses coal mining data. In accordance with NPPF guidance (paras. 109, 120, 121 and 166), this would be a due diligence check to ensure that potential development sites do not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development. This assessment should be undertaken by the LPA using the GIS data provided by the Coal Authority. The Coal Authority notes that the Development Risk product and Surface Coal Resource product were downloaded by the LPA on the 8 June 2015. The LPA should use the most up to date information available to inform its assessments." I note and welcome the fact that the site assessment documents covering the site options does identify ground instability arising from mining legacy and as such The Coal Authority supports the broad approach taken to site selection. We have no views on the actual sites chosen as this is a matter for local determination following consideration of all relevant factors.	
PO1299	Justin Milward	Woodland Trust			Object	(Summary - please see attached document for full version) ASNW - Ruelow Wood at Grid Ref SK022474 is adjacent PAWS/ASNW - MoseyMoor Wood at Grid Ref SK024475 is adjacent ASNW - Straight Hills Wood at Grid Ref SK027471 is adjacent We are concerned that proposed development adjacent or in proximity to the woods will have negative impacts on them, causing damage and potential loss. Ancient woodland is defined as an irreplaceable natural resource that has remained constantly wooded since at least AD1600. The length at which ancient woodland takes to develop and evolve (centuries, even millennia), coupled with the vital links it creates between plants, animals and soils accentuate its irreplaceable status. The varied and unique habitats ancient woodland sites provide for many of the UK's most important and threatened fauna and flora species cannot be re-created and cannot afford to be lost. With Staffordshire Moorlands District Council showing a valuable above average ancient woodland resource at 3.09% of land area compared to a UK average of 2.5%, it is critical that this irreplaceable natural resource is absolutely protected in this Document and highlighted appropriately. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways: Chemically through acidification, eutrophication and toxic pollution, Disturbance by noise, light, trampling and other human activity, Fragmentation as a result of the destruction of adjacent semi-natural habitats,	Comments noted

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Development provides a source of non-native plants and aids their colonisation, Any effect of development can impact cumulatively on ancient woodland - this is much more damaging than individual effects. We would recommend a buffer zone of at least 50 metres of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect the woodland from the change in land use on the site for each allocation. This 50m should be included as part of the policy for each site.	
PO817	Mrs K Foschtinski				General comment	Rural areas should remain just that. If you concrete over all the greenfield space in rural areas you end up with an urban area. Housing should be distributed where it is most needed - in a sustainable location with access to services.	Comments noted
PO1343	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Support	Support the exclusion of Ivy Cottage and its orchard from the proposed housing allocations.	Comments noted
PO1345	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			General comment	The habitat surveys reported a number of features of value in Alton such as species-rich hedgerows – these should also be assessed for potential LWS status.	Comments noted
PO1332	Ms K Dewey	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust			Object	Not all the proposed allocation sites have had ecological surveys carried out. We understand around 11 sites have been added to the proposed allocation sites that were not consulted upon in 2015, and these have not been assessed for their ecological value. The SMDC Local Plan Policy C3 Sustainable Communities - Green Infrastructure 8.7.16 and 8.7.17 references the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, which “ will inform the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and will establish appropriate objectives and targets.” No Green Infrastructure Strategy has as yet been produced. Therefore, we are concerned that this lack of evidence base will not enable good decisions to be made on allocation sites. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys carried out by Lockwood Hall Associates Ltd in 2015 do not comprehensively cover all natural features that the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance list as needing to be mapped as part of ecological networks: the location and extent of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites; Existing designated sites are recognised, but identification of all Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is not as yet comprehensive. In terms of potential allocation sites, there are several where information from the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, other ecological survey reports for planning applications, and habitat data from MAGIC indicate potentially high value habitats, which should be assessed against the Staffordshire Local Wildlife Sites criteria. the distribution of protected and priority habitats and species ; Priority habitats and species are taken to mean those listed as habitats or species of Principal Importance for Conservation in England according to the list under section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, plus those listed on the Staffordshire, and any more local, Biodiversity Action Plan. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys do provide data that	Comments noted. A further Ecological Study has been undertaken and the Council has prepared a Green Infrastructure Strategy. There are specific policies in the Local Plan regarding biodiversity, trees and woodlands.

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						would allow identification of some priority habitats, but do not highlight priority habitats where they are present or use the definitions to describe habitats found. Recommendations for further protected and priority species surveys are made, but full information on their presence has not been gathered. areas of irreplaceable natural habitat , such as ancient woodland or limestone pavement, the significance of which may be derived from habitat age, uniqueness, species diversity and/or the impossibilities of re-creation; This includes veteran trees and ancient hedgerows. Records for these features are not comprehensive. Some veteran tree records are available on http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap It does not appear that this database was searched in the desk studies informing the habitat surveys in 2014. The survey reports do not specifically mention irreplaceable habitats. habitats where specific land management practices are required for their conservation; Some mention is made of current land management in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, but important areas are not highlighted. main landscape features which, due to their linear or continuous nature, are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchanges of plants and animals, including any potential for new habitat corridors to link any isolated sites that hold nature conservation value, and therefore improve species dispersal; Good habitat links and recommended buffer areas are mentioned in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, and the information within the surveys could be used to identify corridors and stepping stones, but specific identification of these features is not part of the report or clearly and consistently highlighted. Corridors and stepping stones need to be recognised and protected, and their other benefits to visual and access amenity in urban areas recognised. areas with potential for habitat enhancement or restoration, including those necessary to help biodiversity adapt to climate change or which could assist with the habitats shifts and species migrations arising from climate change; The ecology surveys would help identify such areas, and some Visual Open Space and Public Open Space areas are proposed in the allocations plans, but areas to be enhanced in terms of habitat value are not specifically identified. information on the biodiversity and geodiversity value of previously developed sites and the opportunities for incorporating this in developments; Previously developed sites are among those proposed for allocation and covered by ecological surveys, which give some recommendations. However geodiversity is not covered. If ecological networks and other GI features could be mapped for each settlement, this would give a good basis for allocating sites, both for hard development, and for green space and environmental enhancements. This would also provide a framework for any CIL monies, partnership projects etc. to target priorities in the area and improve the environmental	

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						quality of each town and village.	
PO2860	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	Whilst we have not assessed each site in detail it is clear that many of them will be crossed by public rights of way which will need to be considered in full as part of any proposed development. We are also in the process of preparing the 4th Review of the Definitive Map and Statement for Staffordshire Moorlands area and the District Council will be provided with copies of the maps and Statement to indicate the alignment of all recorded routes. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council currently hold copies of the existing Definitive Map and Statement which should form part of any discussions with developers regarding the proposed sites. As the Plan progresses we suggest policy provision to ensure that all public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development. If any Public Path Orders are required to enable the development to take place these should be processed alongside the planning application by the District Council. Many of the sites chosen are close to existing urban areas and it is likely that there are non-definitive routes across the sites which should be considered by any applicants. In many cases these routes could have become rights of way by virtue of established usage over many years and should be treated as public. There will also be sites where such usage or historic evidence has already resulted in applications being made to the County Council under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. As the Plan evolves it would be useful to provide guidance to developers/applicants around enhancing the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include: - the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists across Staffordshire where there is currently a shortfall in available access routes. - the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking - the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture The County Council is able to provide further advice and guidance as and when required.	Comments noted.
PO2882	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to more general matters regarding the Local Plan's approach and considering the incorporation of policies for the next iteration the following should be considered. A Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) has previously been prepared for the Staffordshire Moorlands and its focus and extent was informed through discussion with the District Council. The statement regarding the need for further evidence including a 'Heritage Impact Study' (s1.16) of the Staffordshire Moorlands	Comments noted. The Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study provides an assessment of the sites impact on heritage assets. There are policies in the Local Plan regarding heritage assets

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						Local Plan booklet is to be supported and should also be welcomed by Historic England. This Heritage Impact Study should review the previous work of the HEA (and update where required), extend the boundaries of the previous study where necessary and enhance the assessment where appropriate. It should cover all aspects of the historic environment and be undertaken by a suitably experienced historic environment specialist following a detailed brief agreed in advance with Historic England, the SMDC Conservation Team and the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team. We have not assessed each site in detail as it is considered that the Heritage Impact Study (identified in s1.16) will undertake this work with reference to all relevant documentary information and databases (Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Record, National Heritage List for England etc). The Heritage Impact Study should also make use of all available recent studies to inform its assessment including, where appropriate, the relevant Extensive Urban Survey (available on www.staffordshire.gov.uk/ search under EUS) and the historic farmsteads guidance available on the same web pages. Bearing in mind the scale of many of these developments, where appropriate applicants should be encouraged to undertake, as a minimum, a Heritage Statement in support of any application in order to '...describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' (NPPF, s.128). Where more complex remains or larger developments are being considered, then a full Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment should be prepared. In all cases these documents should be prepared at an early stage by appropriately experienced historic environment specialists and they will inform discussions with the Local Planning Authority and their historic environment advisors regarding the need for and scale of any historic environment interventions including opportunities (where appropriate) to enhance heritage assets within a scheme. The Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team would be happy to be consulted by the historic environment specialist appointed to undertake the Heritage Impact Study. We would also be content to advise on the production of Heritage Statements/Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments to inform development proposals and can advise the LPA on, in particular, the archaeological and historic landscape character aspects of specific developments at the planning application stage.	
PO2896	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to the rural area in our previous response we suggested that in sites selection process consideration should be given to the proximity of the site to essential infrastructure and services in order to maximise potential for sustainable modes of transport to be utilised. For example family housing located in close proximity to schools could encourage more journeys to be made on foot to school, which ties into the	Comments noted. Sites have been allocated in line with the Spatial Strategy which seeks to focus development in the main towns with some development in the larger villages.

Others

Question 41 – Do you have any other comments regarding the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						health agenda. We are keen to understand how this has been taken on board in the sites proposed and whether future policy could address areas where it was not possible to provide new homes near to essential infrastructure and services. In relation to the distribution of housing it should be noted that in general, secondary school aged students living beyond three miles from their nearest or catchment area school or without access to a safe walking route are eligible for free school travel provided by Staffordshire County Council. Consideration was given to the potential for additional provision of free mainstream secondary school transport due to the location of Local Plan housing sites. A number of villages in our initial assessment have shown the potential to be eligible including Alton, Bagnall, Biddulph Moor, Boundary, Cookshill, Caverswall, Checkley, Cheddleton, Cotton, Foxt, Froghall, Heaton nr Rushton, Hollington, Ipstones, Kingsley, Kingsley Holt, Lower Tean, Meerbrook, Oakamoor, Rudyard, Rushton Spencer, Stanley, Swinscoe, Waterhouses, Whiston and Winkhill. For the larger villages where indicative housing numbers are provided this amounts to approximately 284 new homes. This will create additional budgetary pressures for Staffordshire County Council and consideration should be given to the requirement for developer contributions to offset this additional cost.	
PO2926	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	See attached transport site comments.	•
PO2930	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			General comment	In relation to surface water flood risk you have provided to us recently a GIS mapping layer of the proposed allocations that we have run through our flood risk software. Attached are our initial comments on the sites and it is hoped that these should help identify any potential issues at each site and assist in framing policy for assessment and SuDS requirements. However, we have only been able to undertake a high level initial assessment at this stage and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you further and perhaps identify sites that require further detailed consideration.	• Comments noted
PO333	Mr Richard Brittlebank	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Object	Please see the comments on Question 34 regarding the omission of LT009 from the preferred sites.	• Comments noted
PO9515	Councillor C Carr				General comment	Email to Consall parish Council 14/07/16 questioning if the piece of land [refer to attached map] can be considered as a development site in Local Plan [use not specified].	• The emerging Local Plan is no longer proposing to define village boundaries for smaller villages Development in these settlements will need to be in accord with the policies in the Local Plan the Spatial Strategy seeks to focus development to the main towns and larger villages limited growth may be acceptable in the smaller provided it is in scale with the settlement and does not have an adverse impact on the countryside. Applications will be determined on a site by site basis in line with policy in the

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
							Local Plan
PO1314	Mr Andrew Leyssens	United Utilities Water Limited			General comment	With respect to the site selection process, we feel it is important to highlight that new development sites are more appropriately located away from locations which are identified as Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1). Groundwater is a vital resource, supplying around one third of mains drinking water in England, however groundwater supplies are under pressure from development associated with an increasing population. United Utilities owns and operates boreholes which are used for public water supply purposes in Rushton Spencer. You should also note that there are a number of groundwater protection zones in alternative locations in your borough which are not assets operated by United Utilities. The details for these locations can be found at http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?lang=_e&topic=groundwater&layer=default&ep=map&layerGroups=default&scale=2&x=357683&y=355134#x=389418&y=357472&lg=1,10,&scale=6 Whilst we recognise it is not currently proposed to allocate any sites for development in the village of Rushton Spencer, United Utilities wishes to emphasise our strong preference for development to take place outside of the Environment Agency designated SPZ1s in this area. The land is designated as such owing to the presence of United Utilities boreholes. It is important to note that these boreholes are a primary source for providing public water supply and represent a key infrastructure resource. As you will appreciate, the safeguarding of the quality of this water supply is critical to United Utilities. As a statutory consultee in the development plan process it is appropriate for us to identify to you where we would prefer development to not take place so that we are able to most appropriately manage the impact on infrastructure in the most sustainable way possible. For your future reference, the Environment Agency has produced the document 'Groundwater protection: Principles and practice (GP3)', which sets out principles and policy guidance for groundwater protection.	Comments noted. See response above
PO1375	Ms Rosamund Worrall	Heritage England			General comment	Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This means that the plan, as a whole (including the sites it is putting forward as allocations) has to set out a framework which is likely to conserve the historic environment of the Plan area. The Plan puts forward a number of sites which, if developed, appear likely to affect the significance of one or more designated heritage assets in their vicinity. The Allocation of a site for development within the Local Plan is, in effect, establishing that the principle of development in that particular location is acceptable. However, in the case of this Local Plan, at present, there is no clear meaningful evaluation of what impact the development of	Comments noted. The Landscape Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study provides an assessment of the sites impact on heritage assets

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						these areas might have upon those heritage assets. The evidence base relies on the Historic Environment Character Assessment of 2010 and the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (LSCA) of 2008 amongst others. It is also noted that the SHLAA methodology includes reference to constraints and opportunities in relation to the LSCA but does not mention the Historic Environment Character Assessment. In addition, it is noted that the Halcrow Toolkit of 2011 used for the Core Strategy information has been used in respect of the current SHLAA. Table 2.1 of the site rating criteria includes reference to designated heritage assets, but there is no reference to non-designated heritage assets, setting or harm. As such, it is not clear how impact on the historic environment has been assessed and subsequently applied to the site options in relation to them being put forward as allocation sites, other than where mentioned in the associated SA. Even in the SA it is not clear how the sites have been assessed in respect of the historic environment. It is also of concern that Para 1.16 of the draft plan sets out that further evidence base studies will be completed to inform the Local Plan including Landscape and Heritage Impact Study. In the Options Sites Assessments tables, part of the evidence base, it is also noted that Heritage Impact Assessments will be undertaken during the plan production if sites, where negative effect on the historic environment and heritage assets has been identified, are taken forward. These assessments should be undertaken and considered at this stage to ensure that the preferred allocation sites are deliverable in respect of the historic environment but, at present, Part 7 of the SA does not deal with this. In the absence of any assessment of the degree of harm which the proposed Allocations might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the authority cannot demonstrate that the sites it is putting forward for development is compatible with the Plan's own policies for the protection of the historic environment. Moreover, in terms of national policy guidance, the Plan also fails to demonstrate that:- (a) The sites that it is putting forward for development will deliver a "positive strategy for the historic environment" as is required by NPPF Paragraph 126. (b) The sites that are allocated will be likely to "contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment". Therefore, it has not shown that it is likely to deliver sustainable development in terms of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 7]. (c) The sites which it has allocated are likely to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance". Therefore it has not shown that it will be likely to deliver the Government's objectives for the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 17]. (d) It has complied with the statutory duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay	

Others

Question 41 – Do you have any other comments regarding the Rural Areas?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Support/ Object/ General Comment	Consultee Comments	Officer Response
						"special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas. Moreover, from the information available there is no evidence that, in preparing the Plan, the local planning authority has had "special regard to the desirability of preserving" any of its Listed Buildings. Whilst it is accepted that S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 does not apply, specifically, to Plan making, the absence of any evaluation potentially brings into question the deliverability of some sites and, for some, the amount of development they can accommodate. When the requirements of the Act are eventually undertaken, it may be found that the quantum of development on some of the sites is, either, unachievable or, at worst, that the need to safeguard the setting of the building actually renders them largely undevelopable. Please note that these comments are based on known heritage assets at a national level and do not include local information available through heritage environment records which should be considered by the local authority.	
PO570	Mr Paul Holdcroft				Support	The strategy of providing 30 dwellings p.a. for infill in the smaller rural areas appears more realistic and appropriate thereto than the previously specific identification of larger sites, and thus mini estates, in some of the smaller villages, which would have ruined their characters and demonstrably been against overwhelming public opinion, strongly expressed in some cases. If this revision be the approved result after final consultation then the Council is to be congratulated on its revised approach as a thoughtful compromise in respect of many of its smaller villages.	Comments noted

This page is intentionally left blank

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO16	Mr Robert Moseley				Object	Building 420 per year within Staffordshire Moorlands and maintaining the green belt, and declaring yourself sustainable-is by definition is not sustainable and will lead to further Greenbelt erosion. 420 homes per year is growth. Alternatives; how many homes are empty? How many are rental and empty? How many homes do the people of Biddulph, not nationally to they need?
PO42	Mr P Rushton				Object	The housing requirement considered during the Whitehead examination in 2013 was, I believe, based on a 2011 census which has since been shown erroneous by a later prediction revealing a requirement of only 2500 homes. There is now no evidence to support the Government and SMDC determination to concrete over the green belt and to destroy the characters of Staffs Moorlands villages.
PO62	Ms Wendy Birks				General comment	Given the changing climate (increasingly intense precipitation) and , pressure to build on floodplains, slopes etc. I believe that all proposed developments, for both residential and employment, should be designed to reduce the rapid runoff off rainfall (in the current jargon "slow the flow") in order that existing properties and the new builds should be protected from the threat of flooding. For example sustainable urban drainage systems and green roofs. I would also like to see opportunities for wildlife to benefit from any developments, therefore stipulations to incude features such as cavities for birds, bats and bees incorporated into buildings and wildlife gardens surrounding them could be included in planning permissions. Likewise all opportunities to install renewable energy generating equipment such as solar panels, hydrothermal heating etc. should be specified by planners.
PO149	Miss Carly Chilton				Object	Having just spent a beautiful weekend in the Staffordshire Moorlands I am outraged at the development plan to urbanise this area of outstanding beauty. We regularly take a ramble through the land designated for development - BD063a we are outraged at this, this particular stretch of land is greenbelt area and as such should be fiercely guarded. We are strong conservationists and abjectly object to the development of greenbelt. The overall impact on wildlife and the landscape would be unforgiveable. Please do not build on one of our favourite country rambles.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO242	Mr Robert Stockley				Object	I believe that decisions are being made without adequate consultation with the population of Staffs Moorlands. The planners are identifying sites from maps, without even bothering to visit the locations for future development. The councillors had to try long and hard to even get the planners out of there offices in Leek, and when they did visit, they were not aware of the potential for the Victoria Colliery site. Newcastle BC have met with Biddulph Councillors, and have agreed that a joint site at the Victoria location in Brown Lees would be beneficial to both councils. Therefore, why haven't the planners included this site in the Local Plan?
PO282	Mrs Sandra Walley				Object	I object to the proposals of building new houses on Green Belt Land. Particularly when the Chancellor George Osbourne MP stated in question time at the House of Commons 25th May 2016 "we will not be using Green Belt to build houses when other better options are available". There are several Brown Field sites within the Biddulph boundaries that have been highlighted to the planning committee, who have ignored the sites and are continuing with their Green Belt proposals. I find this totally unacceptable.
PO802	Mr Timothy Sproston					Whilst I am not convinced that the housing need is there, I appreciate that we have an ageing population and that that waiting lists for social housing are too long. I would see this proposal to build new houses as an opportunity to upgrade the current housing stock, tidy areas of brown field which are an eyesore in the town and improve the infrastructure of Biddulph where required. It does not make sense to lose Green belt land and miss the opportunity to make the positive changes outlined above.
PO625	Ms Alison Conybeare				General comment	I accept that to comply with National Government policy, a certain number of houses are required. I understood these to be mainly aimed at existing urban sites. Therefore, how come 30% are to be placed in rural locations? Is this figure not too high?
PO615	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				Object	Yes it's too great. I don't think these houses are needed in Biddulph.
PO401	Mr David John Allen				Support	Looks fine to me. However, would propose that we try to reinstate dilapidated housing stock

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO552	MRS ANGELA Turner				Object	They are not in any way linked to the available land available in each locality. Having a presumption that land can be taken out of the Green Belt to fulfil what is a generalised figure of 20% or 30% is a poor method of setting targets and already shows an unbalanced appraisal in favour of economic development without any due regard to other issues. These targets should have firstly been set based on available land within the urban boundary or classed as brownfield. SMDC will not be fulfilling the aim of 'Sustainable Development' according to its' true definition by simply taking land out of the greenbelt, moving it into the town boundary and allocating it as a housing site.
PO601	DR William Callender				General comment	We need to provide affordable housing to support employment in the area and provide a demand for local amenities. Given its rural nature it would be better to disperse this development by allowing greater freedom for the conversion of existing buildings or addition of single homes adjacent to others rather than seeking to develop single large sites with many houses.
PO4498	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner [represented by agent] in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound. [Refer to attached letter document and response form].
PO3928	Mr Phil Bamford	Gladman Developments			Object	This submission provides Gladman Development's written representations on the Staffordshire Moorlands Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries Consultation. These representations concern the following matters. Duty to Cooperate Sustainability Appraisal Objectively Assessed Housing Need Development Requirements and Distribution Green Belt Review Preferred Option Sites and Boundaries - Leek. [Refer to 2 submitted attachments].
PO3931	Mr Mike O Brien	WYG			Object	This representation has been prepared by WYG planning & Environment on behalf of Key Plant Automation Limited to support the allocation of land at Bode Business Park, Ball Haye Green, Leek for residential development. The owner of the site is to re-locate the Key Plant Automation business to an alternative location and is considering alternative uses for the present site. This representation aims to demonstrate that further consideration should be given to the allocation of the site for residential use. The attached Representations Report reviews the SMDC housing requirement, including historic delivery, as well as the assumptions that have resulted in the adjusted Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and consequently the increased housing requirement to be achieved over the plan period. It also includes an analysis of the spatial distribution of housing across the district in the context of Leek specifically, and an assessment of SMDC's short term housing requirements within the next five years. The report also focuses on the Bode Business Park site with a review of its suitability for housing, as well as demonstrating that it is no longer a viable employment site. A number of changes to the Local Plan are therefore proposed in relation to: increasing District and Leek housing requirements consequently to allocate more Leek housing sites (including LE243) revisiting residential density expectations; and revisiting the proposed allocations in light of Policy SS5a of the Core Strategy which states that priority will be given to previously developed sites within the urban area.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1620	Mr John Steele				Object	The whole procedure is flawed on the following grounds: a) SMDC allege that the whole procedure is based on a Central Govt. build requirement, although our MP Karen Bradley and the Ministry state that local people must be the deciders of any plan. Since we have already been consulted it seems completely at odds with Govt. policy that our previous responses have largely been ignored. This is particularly true of the considered responses of the Parish Councils who are Statutory Consultees. b) The figure of 6080 additional homes needed by 2031, albeit discounted to 4158 by completions and commitments since 2011, is without sound foundation, because -the net immigration figures must be based on the Staffordshire Moorlands playing its part in housing the net immigration of the potential millions of people either coming from the less favoured parts of the EU or those persons gaining entry, legally or illegally to the EU from the middle east and elsewhere. There is nowhere else all these people could come from but the lack of transparency hides the fact that no provision has been made in terms of the additional expenditures required to settle such people in our environment. -the model used to calculate Labour Supply and it's effect on population used by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners is outdated and fails to take into account the need for the retirement age to evolve in line with increasing life expectancy and generally fitter and active older people. It also fails to account for the trends of working from home and outsourcing to home workers. So the link between labour requirements and population is wrong. In conclusion it seems that this whole plan is being driven the wrong way round. SMDC appear to have decided that the £1000 bounty per home built and the eventual Council Tax revenue as the real objective, so that all the studies are worked to achieve the figures required. Indeed, looking at the Council's future budget propositions the books won't balance without these incomes. If SMDC wish to enter into a serious consultation with residents they should start from the more realistic requirement based on the 2015 Dept. for Communities and Local Government prediction which indicate the need for ONLY 2573 new homes in the Moorlands. Once we have some honesty in the figures the housing allocation exercise would become a genuine and serious consultation meriting a cooperative response.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO2736 PO2748 PO2744 PO2683 PO2678 PO2655 PO2663 PO2724 PO2651 PO2715 PO2616 PO2638 PO2603 PO2607 PO2618 PO2719 PO2710 PO2674 PO2642 PO2765 PO2898 PO2879 PO2851 PO2761 PO2976 PO2810 PO2940 PO2935 PO2986 PO2971 PO2793 PO2815 PO2770 PO2778 PO2991 PO2830 PO2840 PO2647 PO2667 PO2611	Mr R Snow Mrs V Weston Mr J Weston Mr A Hide Mrs D Hide Mr R Owen-Jones Mr C Alcock Mr Albert Allen Mrs Lara Austin Mrs Karen Cartlidge Mr Alan Eaton Mrs Carole Edwards Mr Michael Feather Mrs Angela Feather Mr Damien Flynn Mr Andrew Gibson Mrs Karen Green Mr G Owen-Jones Mr And Mrs T & J Prince Mrs J Weston Mr Alan Moss Mrs Margaret Moss Mr M Tunnicliffe Mr Andrew Weston Mr Jason Baggley A Brattley Mr Barry Fraser Mrs C Fraser Mr Ronald Fryer M Glover Miss A Gregory Mrs Vera James Mrs H Keeling Mr Stefan Lilleker Mr Ian Menzies Lingard Mrs B Massey Mrs Christine Pickin Mr And Mrs T & J Prince Miss Lynne Sanders Mrs Ena Wetwood				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO2659 PO2630 PO2634 PO2728 PO2732 PO2687 PO2691 PO2624 PO2753 PO3015 PO3020 PO3050 PO3045 PO2950 PO2774 PO3101 PO2870 PO3025 PO2757 PO2981 PO2803 PO2960 PO2911 PO2965 PO2996 PO3001 PO2955 PO2845 PO3040 PO3055 PO3247 PO3138 PO3237 PO3153 PO3096 PO3091 PO3133 PO3168 PO3128 PO3163 PO3158 PO3173	Mr A Emery Mrs R Green Mr Clive Green Mr John Elks Mrs Mavis Elks Mr Philip Simcock Ms M Kennaway Mrs J Whitefield Mr D Weston Mrs J Foster Councillor Helen Lingard Mrs Eva Moulton Mr Kenneth George Moulton D Pittman Mrs K Rogers Mrs J Seddon Mrs D Tunnicliffe Mr D Waring Mr Oliver Weston Mrs Susan Wiseman Mrs F Worsley Mrs P Griffiths Mr Raymond James Mr John Shipley Mr Michael Sposito Elvira Sposito Mr Ronald Griffiths Mrs Hazel Simcock Mrs Susan Clare Mr A Shenton Mr C Smith Mr N Watson Mrs M Snow Mrs J Titterton Mrs C Goodwin Mrs B Barks Mr A Ainsworth Mr D Ainsworth Mr G Clewlow Mr D Dunn Mrs P Dunn Mr D Ratcliffe	Cheadle Town Council			Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3221 PO3214 PO3086 PO3209 PO3204 PO3199 PO3194 PO3076 PO3071 PO3299 PO3304 PO3389 PO3543 PO3532 PO3584 PO3253 PO3608 PO3571 PO3428 PO3585 PO3455 PO3454 PO3429 PO3413 PO3324 PO3316 PO3380 PO3280 PO3117 PO3189 PO3242 PO3143 PO3035 PO3030 PO3106 PO2699 PO3148 PO3381 PO3325 PO3463 PO3396 PO3421	Mr D Ratcliffe Mr R Ball Mr A Hewitt Mr J Hewitt Miss K Pickford-Avery Mrs P Routledge Mrs A Rogers Mr W Wordsworth Mr J Lawler Mrs J Birks Mr M Birks Helen Abbey Mrs Michelle Plant Mr Lee Plant Ms Gina Boston K W Alcock Mrs Patricia Allum Mr Lee Austin Mr Craig Beardmore Mr Matthew Boston Mrs Susan Brindley Mr Darryl Brindley Mrs Christine Broad Mr Basil Brunt Mr Peter Brunt Mrs Hazel Brunt Mr Stanley Byatt Mr S Hassell Miss P Millward Miss S Ford Mr R Lees Mr And Mrs J Greenwood Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson Mrs Angela Jones Mr D Gould Mr Eric Cartlidge Mrs J Davies Mrs Vera Byatt Mrs Jill Callear Mrs Joyce Campbell Miss L Chadwick Mrs M Clewes				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3364 PO3258 PO3356 PO3365 PO3341 PO3373 PO3317 PO3412 PO3404 PO3340 PO3269 PO3263 PO3397 PO3405 PO3291 PO3184 PO3066 PO3178 PO3061 PO3231 PO3112 PO3123 PO3226 PO3275 PO4773	Mr Harvey Cope Mr Roger Davis Mr D Fernihough Mr Tommy Frost Mr Colin Hayes Mrs F R Hayward Mrs Mary Jones Mrs Brenda Mills Mr David Tavernor Mr S Waring Mrs J.F. Eaton Mr A.R. Eaton Mr Saul Cutler Mrs Sara Tavernor Mr David Renshaw Mrs P Wordsworth Mr C Foster Mr P Hollywood Mrs A Hollywood Mr N Hewitt Mr I Millward Mr B Clare Mr P Heath Mr and Mrs A Brown Mr A Copcutt				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3285 PO3290 PO3420 PO3667 PO3632 PO3625 PO3462 PO3601 PO3438 PO3439 PO3507 PO3500 PO3580 PO3592 PO3531 PO3488 PO3515 PO3633 PO3487 PO3447 PO3446 PO3478 PO3609 PO3562 PO3617 PO3675 PO3547 PO3616 PO3524 PO3570 PO3563 PO3593 PO3496 PO3495 PO3508 PO3348 PO3471 PO3470 PO3516 PO3357 PO3372 PO3308 PO3333	Mrs C Moseley Mrs B Heesman Mr A Massey K W Alcock Mr Neville Brooks Mrs Pauline Brooks Mr Duncan Campbell Mr K Davall Mr George Davall Mrs Isabel Davall Mr Robert Dennis Mrs Sylvia Dennis Mrs Karen Drummond Mr Alistair Drummond Mr J Edwards Mr Malcolm Elvidge Mrs Anne Fox Mrs Heather Frame Mr Frank Harding Mrs Pamela Johnson Mr Roger Johnson Mr & Mrs D Keates Mrs H Keeling Mr K Mannion Mr Darren Potts Mrs Giovanna Potts Mr & Mrs J & C Smith Mr David Thomas Maria Turley Mrs Jennifer Vasselin Miss Rachel Vasselin Mr Kenneth Weston Mrs Avril Woodward Mr David Woodward Millicent Stevenson Mr Christopher Jones Mr D Hancock Mrs J M Hancock Master J Kennaway Mr David Kennaway Mrs M E Nicholls Mr M Burton Ms Allison Keates				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3264 PO3523 PO3554 PO3555 PO3309 PO3349 PO3653 PO3640 PO3855 PO3660 PO3676 PO3683 PO3684 PO3691 PO3697 PO3704 PO3705 PO3711 PO3715 PO3718 PO3726 PO3727 PO3734 PO3735 PO3742 PO3743 PO3750 PO3751 PO3758 PO3759 PO3766 PO3767 PO3774 PO3775 PO3782 PO3783 PO3790 PO3791 PO3798 PO3799 PO3806 PO3807 PO3815 PO3816	Mr Alan Keates Mr Henry James Gibson Mr John W Bossons Mrs R H Bossons Mr A Gough Mrs J Hewitt Mr K Whitefield Mr David Renshaw Mr Philip Silk Mr and Mrs V M Elks Mr G Hodgkinson Mrs K Smith Mr I Crawford Mrs J Crawford Mr JA Hayes Mr M Shirley Mr and Mrs M Nadova Mr P Cope Mrs J Cope Mr W Elks Mr D Richards Mr M Nad Ms T Janete Miss T Boulton Mrs J Saggars Mr C Loving Mr T Loving Mrs J Richardson Mrs C Hopkinson Mr and Mrs S Abbey Mrs P Richards Mr B Johnson Miss K Beardmore Mrs J Richards Mr R Broad Miss E Clough Mr P Clough Mr G Barks Mr A Wilson Mr P Titterton Miss K Wilson Miss R Oulsnam Miss R Allen Miss J Seddon				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3823 PO3824 PO3646 PO3831 PO3832 PO3839 PO3840 PO3847 PO3848 PO4793 PO4799 PO4814 PO4798 PO4779 PO4813 PO7467 PO7454 PO7461	Mr A Fox Miss T Millward Mr K Pickin Mr A Millward Mr R Turley Mrs D Harrison Mr A Wright Mr D Tomkinson Mrs J Tomkinson Mr Richard Gallagher Jean Horsley Mrs Gillian Smith Mr Keeling Mr and Mrs R & J Lovatt Mrs R Johnson Mr Jack Dempsey Mr C Machin Ms Linda Powell PO7461				Object	The council's assessment (the 2012-based sub national household projections update – Jan 2016 revision) concluded the 250 dwellings per annum was the minimum required. However, despite 1000s of objections in the last consultation the council have not reduced the housing numbers. One of SMDC most valuable assets is its beautiful countryside, and the use of Greenfields. I object overall housing numbers for SM and the use of Greenfields of town and boundaries.
PO4823	Ms Mary Walchester				Support	no comment made
PO7074	MRS PENNY PLANT				Object	I object to the overall housing numbers for Staffordshire Moorlands.
PO7070	Mr Alex Plant				Object	I object to the overall housing numbers for Staffordshire Moorlands.
PO7078	M Ellicock				Object	I object to the housing numbers that have been allocated for Cheadle and Staffordshire Moorlands in general. Particularly the greenfield spaces that fall within the area that has been defined as a Cheadle town boundary. These are the areas that most need the greenfield spaces to prevent oversized blocks of housing and maintain the open and green character enjoyed and used by so many of the existing residents daily.
PO6878	Unknown	Stoddards Ltd	Mr G Willard		Object	The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6932	Mr M Bullock		Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Object	The latest consultation seeks views on the proposed annual housing requirement, which is proposed to be increased from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum on the basis of updated OAN figures. In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum in the adopted Core Strategy, to 320 dwellings as part of the review being carried out as part of the Preferred Options Consultation, our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement, as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. With regard to the proposed distribution of housing across the district, we would support a greater proportion of housing being allocated to Cheadle mindful that - as set out in summary within these representations and in more detail in our earlier representations to the SHLAA and Site Options Consultation - we consider that part of our client's land at Park Lane, Cheadle (site ref: CH165) is a suitable additional housing allocation. As well as asserting the suitability of our client's site itself for housing development, we consider Cheadle has the infrastructure and facilities to accommodate additional housing/growth (with our client's site being in close proximity to the town centre) and that it would have knock-on benefits from provision of additional housing to that currently proposed. Such benefits would include local economic benefits through additional spending in the town centre and at other local facilities and ultimately additional support for the future sustainability and growth of local services.
PO6811	(unknown)		Mr G Willard		Object	The council has decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6897	unknown	Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	Object	Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation. This response is made by RPS Planning and Development (RPS) on behalf of our clients Mosaic Estates (Mosaic), who is promoting land to the north of Cheadle. The principal focus of the Preferred Site Allocations (PSA) document is the proposal of land allocations to meet the requirements set in the 2014 Core Strategy. In addition to this, the PSA also addresses issues relating to housing need which is addressed as part of this response. Housing Need The housing requirement for the District was established in the 2014 Core Strategy, identifying a provision for 6,000 dwellings between 2006 and 2026. In his report on the 2014 Core Strategy, the Core Strategy Inspector indicated that an early review of the Core Strategy would be required, on the basis that the housing requirement for the Core Strategy was based on older evidence of need, derived from the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS). It is recognised that this 'policy on' document does not constitute an Objectively Assessed Need for housing (OAN) as required by the NPPF and NPPG. The NPPG advises that OAN should be based on the most up to date evidence of housing and population need. The Council's January 2016 SHMA update is based on forecasts from the Sub-National Population and Household Projections (SNPP/SNHP), updated biennially, however rely on the 2012 projections. The 2014 SNPP were published in late May 2016 and the complimentary 2014 SNHP is expected on 12 July 2016. It is somewhat unfortunate that the Council has gone out to consultation soon after the publication of new evidence, however by the time that the PSA is ready for submission, there can be no doubt that the implications of the 2014 SNHP will be the most up-to-date evidence. On this basis, it is strongly recommended that the Council revises its evidence of housing need once the 2014 SNHP is published, which can be offered for consultation prior to submission. As the evidence underpinning the OAN needs to be revised, it is not proposed to offer an in-depth critique of the SHMA, however Mosaic do offer the following observations: The Council has opted for an OAN of 320 dwellings per annum (dpa), between 2012 and 2031. This figure is somewhat of a mid-point of the dwelling range 250-440dpa proposed by the 2016 SHMA update. The figure of 320dpa has not adequately accounted for the uplifts required to the demographic projections as a result of forecast employment growth and does not represent OAN. Figure 5.1 of the Council's 2016 SHMA Update includes 5 employment led models of future dwelling need, indicating a range between 319 and 520. The proposed 320 dwellings is only marginally higher than the lowest employment projection in the SHMA (Scenario H) of 319 dwellings. The lowest figure of 319 dwellings is forecast on the assumption that jobs remain static (based on 2012 figures) across the plan period, adjusting only for the changing demographic structure arising from the increases in the ageing population. This is not considered to be a realistic expectation of future growth, which does not account for economic forecasts utilised in other scenarios. As there is currently little certainty of approach, a more appropriate mechanism would be to consider a mid-point between the 5 economic scenarios presented in the SHMA. This would favour a position of 420dpa, as a midpoint between 319 and 520dpa, as a more robust estimation of need. In RPS' view, failure to do this may ultimately result in the plan being found unsound, a situation which is everyone's interest to avoid. In summary, Mosaic welcomes the progress made on the Site Allocations document to date, following on from the 2014 Core Strategy. In RPS' experience, the process of quantifying OAN can be timely and often the subject of intensive scrutiny as part of the Examination process. To avoid unnecessary delays, it is advised that a refresh of the 2016 SHMA Update is undertaken after 12 July 2016 when the latest household projections are available. This will ensure that the Council's strategy for housing growth is grounded in the most up to date evidence. Additionally, the Council should be mindful of the employment projections and ensure that the preferred approach taken is justified and positively prepared.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO6903	unknown	Mosaic Estates	Mr Cameron Austin-Fell	RPS Planning & Development	General comment	Mosaic supports the Council's strategy for distribution to Cheadle, which recognises the sustainability of the town and represents a principal location for future development. Table 3.2 of the Council's PSA indicates that the Council has not performed well against housing requirements to date, noting that there have been only 82 completions to date in Cheadle, along with 205 commitments in the system. This is broadly reflective of the current land supply in the District, as indicated in the Council's latest Housing Delivery Schedule, framed against the position at 31 March 2016 (published October 2015). The position in the latest Housing Delivery Schedule indicates a significant shortfall of housing, capable of meeting only 1.84 years of the housing requirement and far short of the necessary 5 years specified in the NPPF. There is clearly a need to bring sites forward which can deliver. The Council is rightly progressing with the Site Allocations document as a means of addressing this shortfall, however the Council should remain flexible in the allocations proposed, particularly where they are capable of delivering additional sustainable growth. It is therefore considered that preferred allocations proposed by the Council should be drafted as 'minimum' growth figures for each site. This will enable the plan to respond flexibly to local housing need and assist in delivering the Council's shortfall.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9039	Gallagher Developments Ltd	Gallagher Developments Limited			Object	(Mark Rose, Define - Agent) We welcome the recent review of the housing need evidence base, and clearly that should be kept up-to-date throughout the plan making process. We also note the proposed increase in the annual housing requirements, but are concerned that the District Council are not seeking to meet the full objectively assessed need (OAN) in accordance with the NPPF to support the expected level of economic growth, and critically to ensure that the high level of affordable housing need identified in the Borough is addressed. A central tenet of the NPPF is the provision of sufficient housing to meet the needs of present and future generations and, in doing so, to widen the choice of housing (paragraphs 7 and 9). To achieve that it requires (paragraph 14) “ local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area ”, that “ Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change ”, and set out a “ clear strategy for allocating sufficient land ” (paragraph 17). Delivery is underpinned by paragraph 47, which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing requiring local planning authorities to “ use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area ” [my emphasis]. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update concludes (para. 5.40) that there is a housing OAN range of between 250 dpa and 440 dpa. It continues (para 5.43) to state that “ This OAN range provides a realistic level of housing delivery which will support economic growth and address potentially worsening housing market signals, whilst meeting the full demographicallyassessed need for housing in the District .” But notably it earlier states (para. 5.33) that: “ there is a clear need to uplift the figures to take account of the significant affordable housing need in Staffordshire Moorlands ”; and (para 5.36) that “ the previous SHMA (2014) identified a need for 707 affordable housing dwellings annually over the next five years. This must be taken into consideration by the Local Authority when deriving the most appropriate housing requirement for its Local Plan .” Furthermore at paragraph 5.38 point 8 it states “ To ensure that there is no disconnect between the housing OAN and the Council’s economic scenarios, in order to justify a figure below 438 dpa, SMDC would need to demonstrate how it would mitigate or avoid the adverse housing, economic and other outcomes that a lower growth approach could give rise to .” It later continues (para. 5.44) “ It would also need to evidence how the adverse impact of meeting housing need would ‘significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’ [the Framework, §14] as well as make provision, through the duty-to-cooperate, for those needs to be met in full elsewhere within the wider HMA .” The consequences of not planning to meet the identified need would be dire. The Housing Strategy for England “Laying the Foundations” states in paragraph 1 that a “thriving, active but stable housing market that offers choice, flexibility and affordable housing is critical to our economic and social wellbeing.” It continues to highlight (paragraph 5) that “we have not built enough homes for more that a generation and the credit crunch has simply compounded this challenge”, and (paragraph 8) that “without urgent action to build new homes, children will grow up without the same opportunities to live near their families, young people will struggle to get a place to call their own and older people will not have the choice and support they need.” Furthermore, paragraph 9 states: “Housing is crucial for our social mobility, health and wellbeing – with quality and choice having an impact on social mobility and wellbeing from an early age, and our homes accounting for about half of all household wealth. Social housing should provide support for those who need it, when they need it, and should help vulnerable people to live independently. And opportunities for wealth must be open to all, with housing choices helping rather than hindering people’s ability to build assets and find employment.” On the basis of the evidence presented as part of this consultation it is apparent that the District Council has not justified how it would mitigate or avoid the adverse socio-economic impacts of their preferred lower growth approach, how the adverse impact of meeting housing need would ‘significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’, or how those needs would be met elsewhere in the Housing Market Area. Consequently, my clients contend that the Local Plan Review should progress on the basis of seeking to deliver the full OAN of 440 dwellings per annum and 8,800 dwellings in total. We note the residual housing requirement of 885 dwellings for Biddulph identified in Table 3.2 of the consultation paper. However, in light of the District’s development strategy that focuses on the Market Towns including Biddulph, and the above comments in relation to the full OAN, that residual requirement can only be considered an absolute minimum figure for the town.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9043	Mr and Mrs Siddorn				General comment	(Agent - G Willard) The council have decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound.
PO9056	Mrs Joyce Tagell				Object	(Agent - Hourigan Connolly) Summary of comments - full version attached Covering letter and report promoting BD083 on behalf of Mr & Mrs Tagell. objecting to the Council's OAHN of 320 dwellings pa and supporting a figure of at least 440 dwellings pa accordingly objecting to the Council's published residual housing requirement for the rural areas as it should be increased to reflect 440 pa figure (at 28% of District total) criticising the Council's 5 year housing supply figure/housing delivery backlog and argues it is actually lower than published, through alternative calculation methodologies objecting to Council assumptions used in factoring in allowance for annual infill, when calculating how much land needs to be formally allocated in rural areas, and arguing this will result in failure to meet (rural) housing needs. accordingly, client's land (BD083) should be included as an additional site.
PO9079	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	The high level of housing provision to secure net migration into the area is not a sustainable model. In 2031 the population base will have increased, some of which will form an ageing population. What for 2031 - 2046 an net migration of 10,000? A sustainable approach counts for increased assisted living, longer working life and doesn't rely on drawing migrants from other areas. It is not possible to control who those migrants are, e.g. are they working age? The model doesn't account for these factors.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9061	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	Summary of representation (see attached response). The local community should decide the level of housing that they require. SMDC have clear evidence in several previous consultations and petitions submitted that the local community are against the excessive housing levels proposed. SMDC have failed to reduce the allocation to Cheadle which does not reflect the 5500+ responses that SMDC received in 2015 and does not take into account road traffic congestion, long term sustainability, the environemnt, damage to agriculture and access to doctors and dentists etc. The 2012 ONS population projections project a much reduced levelling off of the population across the Moorlands. These figures came out after the 6000+ housing targets were set. It indicates a much lower housing requirement of 2573 compared with the 6000+ figure. SMDC have not seized on these figures to justify a reduction in our housing provision and have failed to disseminate this information. SMDC effectively justifies retention of high levels of housing using an Oxford Economics Model supplied as part of the 'additional work' that SMDC have commissioned, produced by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners. It draws the assertion that due to an ageing population to see a net gain of 85 jobs through to 2031 it is necessary to secure a net migration of 7,697 people into the area. This document has never been disseminated to or shared with residents or action groups as part of the consultation and been produced as evidence to justify retention of high housing figures.The officer response has been that Councils have to abide by over-riding National Policy, effectively making a mockery of any local opinion.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9068	Mr Greg Powell	Cheadle Unite			Object	Summary only (please see attached response) Failure to co-operate and promote an effective strategy for the region. Cheadle Unite have for over 6 years been asking SMDC to work closely with our Local City 'Stoke-on-Trent' (S-o-T) on the regeneration of brownfield sites and where affordable hosuing can be built for our younger generation. SMDC can play a key role by collaborating and setting an overall housing figure with S-o-T and the Potteries that reduces our allocatio. S-o-T have acknowledged that development opportunities outside the regeneration areas draws developers away and creates uncertainty. Cheadle residents have made it clear that the allocation should be reduced and provision for this can be made under a duty to co-operate. SMDC continues to evade grasping this issue as is stated 'Stoke-on-Trent City Council is in the early stages of preparing a joint Local Plan with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council. At this stage, the evidence to support the plan, including the capacity to meet housing needs has yet to be established'.
PO9624	Mr R Lloyd				Object	(Summary of comments - full version attached) Government housing allocations are excessive and unrealistic due to lack of modern infrastructure to support new development.
PO9264	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	The latest consultation seeks views on the proposed annual housing requirement, which is proposed to be increased from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum on the basis of updated OAN figures. In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum in the adopted Core Strategy, to 320 dwellings as part of the review being carried out as part of the Preferred Options Consultation, our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement, as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The district-wide and Biddulph-specific housing and other development requirements, including those established in the Core Strategy, have necessitated a review of settlement and Green Belt boundaries, and such a strategy for releasing sites from the Green Belt through the Local Plan process is supported.
PO9242	Mr Lee Dawkin	Renew Land	Mr Ben Weatherley	Knights LLP	Support	In response to the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement from 300 in the adopted Core Strategy to 320 dwellings per annum as part of the Local Plan Review our client supports the proposed increase in the annual housing requirement as this increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9838	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	Object	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached]: SMDC SHMA (2014) concluded that there was a need for 260-440 homes per year across SMDC plus affordable housing. The Consultation Document states at paragraph 3.10 that choosing the middle of the range would 'retain the same number of jobs as the present day'. However the Council have chosen a requirement of just 320 dwellings per annum, and this figure falls slightly short of the middle of the range position. The Staffordshire Moorlands 2012-based Sub-National Household Projections Update - January 2016 Revision provides a summary of the scenarios that were tested. All scenarios led to a decrease in job growth. A 10% uplift is then added in a second Scenario's table within the 2016 Update. the analysis within Appendix 4 of the 2nd March Council Assembly report does not justify why the full OAN of 440 dwellings per annum cannot be met, given that the report lists the benefits of delivering 440 dwellings. a requirement of 440 p.a. will provide affordable housing and economic benefits; 320 p.a. will not. In a District where there has not been a five year housing land supply for 6 years; and where affordable housing need is set to outstrip any market housing that will be delivered in the next 2 years at least, there can be no greater pressure for a LPA to choose to meet its full OAN. Therefore object to para 3.11 Preferred Options Consultation document which states 320 p.a.would ". .Sustain a modest increase in jobs over the plan period by increasing the size of the workforce in comparison with lower levels of housing growth ". To plan for economic growth, the Council must plan for the higher end of the range, i.e. 440 dwellings (minimum). consider that the Plan is internally inconsistent, confusing ie para 3.10 conflicts with para 3.11: "maintain jobs" v "modest increase in jobs". A less than midpoint figure means jobs would decrease. NPPF states..Where sites are available, suitable and achievable, with the support of a willing landowner – as in this case, then strong support should be given towards their development. St Modwen maintained the support for the allocation of the Blythe Vale site for employment use [since 2015]. St Modwen consider that the delivery of the Blythe Vale site is most achievable in circumstances where the development is of a mixed use, as opposed to the restricted use class that the RIS allocation supports [and restrictive planning conditions on existing consent]. The SHLAA methodology explains that sources of supply should include: 'land allocated in plans for employment and other uses' and 'unimplemented /outstanding planning permissions' however later states areas identified in the Employment Land Study as appropriate for retention, are excluded. The St Modwen site was not, (and should have been at the time of the SHLAA being prepared), assessed as a potential development site for housing. The NLP 2014 Employment Land Review does not, in reporting on the availability of land, state that the RIS must be retained and therefore we considered it should have been assessed within the SHLAA. NLP report states investment is needed to improve the quality of key employment sites. This will be possible where a scheme is viable and deliverable and it is through making these representations that St Modwen seek to achieve this for Blythe Vale. The SHLAA (2015) identifies the land that has been assessed as part of the Council's consideration of suitable housing land [excluded this site]. This approach was flawed, given that within the Local Plan Boundary, the St Modwen site (and the adjoining land south of the A50) is the only site at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook that is not within the Green Belt. [Evidence Base Report includes comparative assessment of the site and this clearly demonstrates the suitability of the St Modwen site for allocation]. In respect of the potential for allocating the St Modwen site, we have reviewed the infrastructure capacity of the settlement of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, and present a review of services and facilities within the accompanying Evidence Base Report. Given that neither the SMBC Local Plan consultation document nor its evidence base assesses the potential of the St Modwen site to deliver housing or a mixed use scheme, there has been no assessment of the balanced range of these environmental effects. We consider the most appropriate scenario to follow is the 'policy-off' economic-led scenario whereby the net commuting ratio is maintained at the existing level, and the level of housing required to support the Oxford Economics forecast is determined. Growth of at least 438 dpa (rounded to 440 dpa) is therefore considered justified.. as full OAN. [We acknowledge that this would have the effect of reducing the five year housing land supply position further from the 1.64 years..] We also consider that the distribution of housing requirement should be reconsidered and that a greater proportion should be afforded to the settlement of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. If the Housing Requirement were increased to 440 dpa, this would equate to an additional 638 dwellings within the Rural Area. Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook receives 15% of the new allocations growth afforded to the Rural Areas. 15% of the increased Rural Area Growth would equate to circa additional 97 dwellings that could be required in Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. Given the nature of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook and its tightly constrained boundaries, the rationale would be for any additional growth to be on an allocated site or sites, not a windfall. Our sustainability assessment of the village..clearly

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
						demonstrates that a larger proportion, (and a larger proportion within an increased overall Housing Requirement) is justified. Council may wish to consider a new designation of 'Main Rural Centre' that could be afforded to certain Larger Villages [such as Blythe Bridge], recognisant of their role and potential for growth.
PO10250	Mr Andy Brown	Harlequin Development Strategies (Crewe) Limited	Mr Alan Knott	Knights LLP	Support	Support proposal for increased annual housing requirement from 300 dwellings per annum to 320 dwellings per annum. This increase is considered to be justified by the latest evidence of housing need contained in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The proposed distribution of housing across the area is also supported including providing 28% of the overall housing requirement in rural areas. The provision of additional housing in the rural area would enable the open market and affordable housing needs of rural communities to be met in areas local to them which would support the delivery of sustainable communities in terms of meeting housing needs and supporting local services.
PO4710	Mr Gez Willard	Willardwillard Ltd			General comment	Response form and letter submitted, providing responses to questions 1, 33, 34 (ie Alton boundary), 37 and 41. Question 1 response: The council have decided to plan for a middling level of housing growth. This is a complicated area of planning policy and the site owner in this case wishes to reserve the right to object to it as the plan evolves and should they consider the figures unsound. The council are especially urged to be mindful of seeking affordable housing contributions on smaller and medium sized housing sites which may be either financially unviable or undeliverable because of the smaller number of units on site. Lower thresholds and accepting off site contributions may prove to be a more pragmatic means of achieving the delivery of affordable housing units whilst without preventing the delivery of adequate housing supply. Table 4.16 indicates that 13 new houses might be provided on this site (AL012) . The council have taken the figure from the submission of an indicative housing layout submitted with planning application SMD/2014/0824. The site may not be developed as set out on this indicative plan which itself provided for the retention of the existing house. The site is considered suitable for a variety of housing types and forms dependent upon the assessed needs of the market at the time and the intentions of the site owner (who may indeed choose to continue to live on site). Such uncertainties could mean that under 10 houses are actually provided on the site or as many as 20 or so. The council need to allow for such flexibility in their plan making.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO609	MRS ELLEN FAULKNER				Object	The infrastructure of biddulph first needs upgrading to meet demand of extra residents
PO548	Mr Terry Barber				Object	We have, in the Biddulph North ward, in the last three years, been subjected to a new housing estate of nearly 200 houses on the old Selectus Ribbon factory land. This new estate has already imposed pressure with traffic, education, policing and health needs onto the area. Greenbelt land is proposed to be lost on the land that stretches towards Biddulph Moor. Loss of soak up, in this area will increase the likelihood of flooding to the Biddulph North area and also to the lower lying areas of Biddulph (the lower end of Thames Drive and Pennine Way) which have suffered from flooding in the past. Any reduction in trees and soil will therefore impose unreasonable threats of environmental hazards onto the inhabitants of this area and I would strongly recommend that residents take the council to the courts to pursue summonses for reckless and irresponsible behaviour that amounts to willful damage to the lifestyle and livelihoods of the area's inhabitants.
PO387	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Object	The proposed number of houses for Cheadle seems far too large and unsustainable for the town as it is. I would ask why Stoke on Trent council were not taken up in their offer to take some of our allocation when they have land/areas that are prime for development?
PO9446	Mrs Anne Donaldson				Object	We are writing to register our objections to the proposed development in and around Cheadle. The scale of the proposed development is out of balance with the infrastructure and employment opportunities that already exist. The proposed housing developments would create additional surface water issues that already cause Tean to flood. There is a potential of a further 2000/2500 vehicles resulting from building over a 1000 new homes in Cheadle. The roads are already inadequate to deal with the flow of traffic. The proposed link road will not ease this congestion as it will merely move the problem to another part of town. The Public Open Spaces shown on the map are largely playing fields linked to schools to which public have no access. Should the proposed development go ahead on the south west side of the town there will be a great need to public open space that can be accessed by the public, as this area houses predominately the older generation who would lose the open fields that the farmer currently allows access on for walking.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1049	Mr John Bevan	Cheadle Unite			Object	At before & since the meeting of 17th May virtually eveyone in Cheadle agrees we dont want any more houses, apart from small scale infilling. Each house would mean an average of 2 or more people & 2 cars. The infrastructure of roads (particularly), doctors, schools, services etc cant cope now. However if we must have more houses the best place for them is a new estate around a new link road between the "new" JCB factory in Leek road and Brookhouses.Many would walk/cycle to JCB (saving the environment) most of the new estate & existing traffic would use the new road towards Cellarhead or Blythe Bridge for S-on-T, Leek & the A50, removing congestion from Cheadle centre, (furthermore if the road from Brookhouses to Draycott over New Haden was improved that would provide a superior route from Leek road, Cheadle to the A50 at Draycott.) You will say its Green Belt, well use the power that enabled you to allow JCB to build in the Green Belt at Leek road to allow this link road/estate scheme to go ahead,- its what the people of Cheadle want- move or use the green belt. Incidentally the proposed road from Brookhouses to Mobberley will not lessen traffic in Cheadle because traffic between Tean & Blythe bridge wont use it - obviously. Small villages need more houses to maintain local services- shops, pubs, schools, churches etc plus if they are on a main road can easily cope with extra traffic.
PO1504 PO1496 PO1511 PO1518	Mrs J L Taylor Mr J P Taylor Mr P Taylor Mr T A Taylor				Object	I object to the housing numbers that have been allocated for Cheadle and Staffordshire Moorlands in general. Particularly the greenfield spaces that fall within the area that has been defined as a Cheadle town boundary. These are the areas that most need the greenfield spaces to prevent oversized blocks of housing and maintain the open and green character enjoyed and used by so many of the existing residents daily.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO9052		Hourigan Connolly			Object	Covering letter and report promoting land south of A52, Kingsley for housing (on behalf of Dean Lewis Estates) submitted in response to Questions 1, 33, 36, 37 and 41: objecting to the Council's OAHN of 320 dwellings pa and supporting a figure of at least 440 dwellings pa accordingly objecting to the Council's published residual housing requirement for the rural areas as it should be increased to reflect 440 pa figure (at 28% of District total) criticising the Council's 5 year housing supply figure/housing delivery backlog and argues it is actually lower than published, through alternative calculation methodologies objecting to Council assumptions used in factoring in allowance for annual infill, when calculating how much land needs to be formally allocated in rural areas, and arguing this will result in failure to meet (rural) housing needs. accordingly, client's land at A52 Kingsley, should additionally be allocated for residential (around 50 dwellings) Council's Green Belt Review lacks credibility and is not justified. queries Council's 'Suitability' assessment of SHLAA site KG032 submit Landscape and Visual Overview report that concludes client's site is suitable for allocation and preferable to other options sites, including preferred option KG049A. Consequently objects to KG049A. [Refer to attachments].

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO855	Mr Daniel Noble				Object	There are three main topics on which I object to these plans, specifically the draft potential allocations and reserve sites along Mount Road. Concerns that the local infrastructure cannot support the level of building proposed The spoiling of a popular amenity Concerns over flood risk Many of the proposed potentially developable sites are in the East of Leek, suggesting a large quantity of housing will be built in the east end to fulfill the proposed housing requirements. The east side of Leek is already stretched when it comes to critical amenities such as schools and County Education acknowledged this in the 2015 consultation. However I don't believe that any suggestions have been put forward by the District and County Council. I believe this to be a significant roadblock and should be addressed before continuing with the housing consultation. It should be clear that any significant building on this or any of the Mount sites will require improvements to the road including, but not limited to, widening and creation of pavements and better access from the Ashbourne Road end. Access for residents on this site will make the Mount much busier - especially considering my comments above that multiple proposed sites will need to be built on to support the plan. This will mean a popular "quiet lane" will become not only much busier but a "rat run" from the Buxton Road to the Ashbourne Road. This would be a hugely negative impact on an important local amenity i.e. The Mount. The Options Site Assessments report (Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf) acknowledges that building on this site will require improvements to the badly potholed eastern end of Kniveden Lane, thus creating a through access for motor vehicles that doesn't currently exist in a satisfactory form. The estate taking in Kniveden Lane and Moorland Road is currently very quiet and is not generally used as a through route. This makes it a relatively safe place for children to play outside and I have significant concerns that losing this sense of security would be another reason to discourage children from playing outside. Our children need encouragement to be active, not discouragement through reduced safety. The Mount - particularly south of Kniveden Lane - is an extremely popular semi-rural location which is used by many for walking, cycling, horse-riding and running. It is a sound surface with superb far-reaching views, offering uniquely easy access to enjoy a stunning countryside location. Any building on the proposed LE128 site will spoil the views that extend to the Roaches, Shutlingsloe, the Cloud and beyond. With well-recognised concern that many people are not maintaining a satisfactorily healthy lifestyle, any spoiling or removal of a locally and culturally important leisure amenity would be a huge blow to not just the east end of Leek but the whole town. I am astounded that Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust responded to the 2015 consultancy claiming LE140 has no major views out. This plot is an extremely popular amenity and building on here would be a huge loss of an open space for local residents. Severn Trent Water have acknowledged that "t hey have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development." However I've not seen any specifics in the Options Site Assessments - Towns.pdf and this concerns me in relation to plot LE128a/b which continues to have significant drainage issues. Frequently rainwater can be seen draining off LE128b at the SW corner and onto Moorland Road. My concern is that if draft potential allocation LE128a is built on (regardless of whether reserve allocation LE128b is built on) this drainage problem will be exacerbated and I've seen no plan or evidence of how that will be remedied. As per my 2015 consultation response I should re-iterate that the land drains that lead off LE128 into the culvert under the gardens of the easterly Moorland Road properties already struggle to cope with the water run-off from LE128. I have grave concerns that the existing drains will not support the necessary drainage of the proposed housing development. This is especially pertinent since I'm resident at the SW corner of the proposed plot on the Moorland Road side and get the bulk of the water draining under and across our plot.
PO3918		Hourigan Connolly			Object	Hourigan Connolly is promoting land at Buxton Road, Leek for inclusion in the Staffordshire Moorlands District Local Plan as a housing allocation. [Report submitted that responds to Questions 1, 6, 10 and 14 from consultation document].

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO3921	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			Object	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client 's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Report submitted which responds to consultation Questions 1,2,9,10,34.37,38].
PO63	Mr. and Mrs. Frederick and Nora Cartlidge				Object	Firstly building on Greenbelt land is a complete no no for me. Especially as there is ugly brown field sites which could benefit our area were they used for development. It seems extraordinary that greenbelt is even being suggested as Prime Minister's manifesto stated that greenbelt land would be protected. Since March 2015 and in contradiction to the manifesto policy to , "protect the greenbelt," 25% more houses are planned on greenbelt land. It would make sense to make FULL USE OF BROWNFIELD SITES WITHIN BIDDULPH CONURBATION. i.e. CHATTERLEY WHITFIELD SITE. THE DAVERA FURNITURE BUILDING.(MINSTER MILLS) in the town centre. Could they be made an offer , to move onto another site so as to free up the huge building/area where they now reside? OLD MILL BUILDING ON STATION ROAD. OLD DYE WORKS CONGLETON ROAD. At this point it would seem absolutely the most efficient way in which to solve this problem. Indeed, an excellent chance to tidy up and definitely impress; the overall area of natural beauty such as is BIDDULPH, enhanced, made even more attractive for visitors to Staffs. Moorlands. We need to retain our greenbelt. Even our Prime Minister vowed "to protect the greenbelt" (Manifesto speech). Last week , in Parliament I witnessed George Osborne stating exactly this. In doing so we prevent urban sprawl and protect our wildlife, flora and fauna, an absolute must for our ECO SYSTEM. Dame Fiona Reynolds, previously Director General of the National Trust for eleven years, 2001-2012, stated in the Telegraph 8/5/16 that planning applications for these areas has risen by more than a quarter since last year`s election. To back this claim she quoted research carried out by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) SHOWING274,792 homes are planned on Green-belt land in England, 55,000 more than were planned in March last year, proving the Government was contradicting their manifesto pledge to PROTECT GREENBELT LAND., THE RIBBON OF LAND STRETCHING AROUND TOWNS AND CITIES TO PREVENT URBAN SPRAWL. The Conservative Manifesto said some really good and positive things. The question is can it be sustained? The easier it is to nibble away at the green-belt the less effort gets put into imaginative regeneration. So, lets ALL make sure we protect the green-belt in and around Biddulph. Indeed, that goes for the whole of Staffs. Moorlands Once its gone we shall never get it back. But the ugly Brownfield sites will still remain. Dame Fiona Reynolds is now Master of Emmanuel College Cambridge.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO955	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	Mr Kenneth Wainman	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	General comment	It is contended that the Council's approach allocating particular proportions of development to the towns, villages and rural areas is too regimented and arbitrary and that allocations or requirements for specific areas rather being allocated on a percentage or formula basis should be based on the capacity of a town or village to absorb or provide for development without material harm. It is possible that some of the rural settlements could accommodate more houses than proposed by either extending development boundaries(incl. infill) or allocating sites. This could help relieve or avoid the issues associated with some proposed sites in the District, such as for example the Mount in Leek. More development could be accommodated in villages. This would be in accord with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Framework which states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Locating more houses in the villages would help maintain them and enhance their vitality as well as possibly increasing services and facilities such as supporting village schools.

Question 1 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed housing requirement ?

ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Support/ Object/ General comment	General comment - reasons - Please explain your views.
PO1613	Mr Charles Harris				Object	Without the detailed analysis it difficult to comment on the plan as a whole other than in general terms, however I am not convinced that the assessment of future housing need underpinning the plan is sufficiently robust and sensitive, nor does it take into account demographic change and other population trends. For example; Over 80% of the UK population lives in towns and cities; this ratio is expected to rise to c90% by 2035 (NB Concentrating populations can help to tackle climate change and reduce carbon emissions) The population growth in areas like Staffordshire Moorlands is likely to grow at a slower rate than for England as a whole Lower levels of per capita income in the area suggest there is a need for a greater emphasis on affordable housing The housing needs of an aging population are not adequately recognized - a missed opportunity as this could improve housing market opportunities for growing families Cuts in rural public transport services are a great concern to many. This has led to a greater use of private cars and is increasing isolation and deprivation for people without access to the own personal transport further. This supports the need to focus growth on towns and cities National policies and fiscal actions affecting second homes and the private rented sector have not been factored in The opportunity to bring existing vacant and derelict properties back into use is missed, greater emphasis should be placed on using brownfield sites - there is strong support for this from both local councillors and local people. One of the core principles of the NPPF is to “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that is it not of high environmental value”. This suggests to me that more dwellings are being planned for than will be needed over the lifetime of the plan. My concern is that this may lead to more building than is necessary; too many of the wrong sort of homes, in the wrong place, at the cost of a irreversible loss of green field and priority habitats. This is exacerbated by a narrow interpretation of sustainability, which gives insufficient weight to the importance and value of biodiversity and infrastructure. Biodiversity has a key role in defining the local Moorlands character and distinctiveness and is an important part of local cultural heritage. I have chosen to comment by e-mail rather using the on-line option, which is not particularly user friendly. I hope that this feedback can be taken into account in reviewing the plan.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO9041	Gallagher Developments Ltd	Gallagher Developments Limited	Mark Rose	Define	Biddulph BD076 / BD076a	Object	My clients would object to a mixed use and employment allocation of 3.5ha in the northern part of Core Strategy Broad Area 4 (BD076 / BD076A). There has been a long standing allocation on that site, and they have marketed it for employment and commercial uses for over 10 years without success. Their firm view is that residential development is the only viable use on the site, and as such the entire site should be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan review. That course of action is explicitly supported by the NPPF which states (para. 22) that “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.” Indeed, the Employment Land Requirements Study states (para. 8.4) that: “Whilst adopted and emerging Local Plan policies may seek to safeguard against the loss of employment land to other uses it is likely that, over the course of the plan period, some land will be lost to alternative use (for example where they are no longer suitable for employment use). In accordance with the Practice Guidance, market signals should be used by the LPAs as a guide to whether losses in certain areas will be appropriate or not.” It later (para 8.18) states: “any new provision should ensure that the layout, location and type of space is attractive to the market rather than purely focusing on the quantum of space delivered”. Furthermore, it is questioned whether the need actually exists for an employment allocation on this site in Biddulph. The consultation paper refers to an employment land requirement of 35ha in the District (para 3.16) which is in the middle of the range identified in the Employment Land Requirements Study (para 7.108: 25-45ha). However, the Study states: “it is recognised that the labour supply projections which link to the Objectively Assessed Housing Need are towards the lower end of this range. Whilst it has been acknowledged that there is not a direct causal link between housing and employment land requirements, there is nevertheless a need to ensure that the two dovetail together to avoid any unsustainable outcomes”. Moreover, in relation to Biddulph specifically the consultation paper identifies a residual employment land requirement of only 1.95ha in Table 3.3, and a need for a 1000m2 discount foodstore in Table 3.4, but then proposes the allocation of a total of 10.24ha of employment land in and around the town. Consequently, in relation to Broad Area 4, given the clear lack of market interest in employment or commercial uses on the site, and the over riding need to increase the housing land supply in town as highlighted above, it is contended that these areas in the site should also be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan review as part of the wider site allocation.
PO362	Miss Jenna Woolliscroft				Biddulph	Object	Wildlife, beautiful scenery,
PO513	Mr Denver Johnson				Biddulph	Object	I've been a resident of Biddulph for forty one years and have seen many developments in the location over the years. Happily over that time the green spaces and views have survived relatively unchanged within that time, maintaining the spirit of a rural conurbation. The current threat to those very Green Belt spaces that set Biddulph apart as a little gem is untenable. It seems that crooked National government have connived with big developers (party sponsors) to twist arms up backs of Development Officers and override Councillors/Local Public Opinion to cherry pick development locations that they hope will bring in the most cash. Stupid insofar that any big development so close would bring down local property prices.
PO43	Mr P Rushton				Brown Edge	General comment	In the not too distant past Brown Edge had considerable employment sites occupied by a multiplicity of businesses. The SMDC Planning Authority have consistently allowed their replacement with houses, creating a situation which obliges residents to seek facilities and services in the adjacent City. Even before the proposed major housing development, Brown Edge is in dire danger of losing identity as a large Moorlands village and of becoming yet another urban housing area on the lines of neighbouring Norton but without the facilities and services. .

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO388	Mrs Joanne Chadwick				Cheadle EM2	General comment	The employment land allocation for Cheadle is accessed by Draycott Cross road which is not suitable for heavy traffic and HGV's. It is steep, windey and narrow in places. Why has there not been further development in the north area where JCB have already erected 2 factories and improved the road to make access out of Cheadle More streamlined. This would seem to make more sense and have less impact on town traffic.
PO2735 PO2747 PO2743 PO2682 PO2677 PO3752 PO2656 PO2664 PO2723 PO2652 PO2696 PO2714 PO2615 PO2639 PO2604 PO2608	Mr R Snow Mrs V Weston Mr J Weston Mr A Hide Mrs D Hide Mrs J Richardson MR R OWEN-JONES Mr C Alcock Mr Albert Allen Mrs Lara Austin Mr Eric Cartlidge Mrs Karen Cartlidge Mr Alan Eaton Mrs Carole Edwards Mr Michael Feather Mrs Angela Feather				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.
PO2718 PO2739 PO2673 PO2643 PO2764 PO2894 PO2878 PO2855 PO2760 PO2975 PO2939 PO2934 PO2985 PO2970 PO2792 PO2814 PO2769 PO2777 PO2990 PO2838 PO2944 PO2648 PO2668 PO2660	Mr Andrew Gibson Mrs Karen Green Mr Gareth Owen-Jones Mr And Mrs T & J Prince Mrs J Weston Mr Alan Moss Mrs Margaret Moss mr michael tunnicliffe Mr Andrew Weston Mr Jason Baggley Mr Barry Fraser Mrs Catherine Fraser Mr Ronald Fryer M Glover Miss Angela Gregory Mrs Vera James Mrs H Keeling Mr Stefan Lilleker Mr I Menzies Lingard Mrs Christine Pickin D Pittman Mr & Mrs T & J Prince Miss Lynne Sanders Mr A Emery				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO2631 PO2635 PO2727 PO2731 PO2686 PO2690 PO2625 PO2752 PO3014 PO3019 PO3034 PO3010 PO3049 PO3044 PO2949	Mrs Rosemarie Green Mr Clive Green Mr John Elks Mrs Mavis Elks Mr Philip Simcock Ms Marie Kennaway Mrs J Whitefield Mr D Weston Mrs J Foster Cllr Helen Lingard Mr & Mrs L & D Stevenson Mr Desmond Barnes Mrs Eva Moulton Mr K G Moulton D Pittman	Cheadle Town Council					
PO2773 PO3100 PO3024 PO2980 PO2801 PO2909 PO2964 PO3029 PO2995 PO3000 PO2954 PO2844 PO3039 PO3105 PO3054 PO3246 PO3137 PO3147 PO3236 PO3152 PO3095 PO3090 PO3132 PO3220 PO3241 PO3213 PO3085 PO3208 PO3203	Mrs K Rogers Mrs J Seddon Mr D Waring Mrs Susan Wiseman Mrs Florence Worsley Mr Raymond James Mr John Shipley Mrs Angela Jones Mr Michael Sposito Elvira Sposito Mr R Griffiths Mr H Simcock Mrs Susan Clare Mr D Gould Mr A Shenton Mr C Smith Mr N Watson Mrs J Davies Mrs M Snow Mrs J Titterton Mrs C Goodwin Mrs B Barks Mr A Ainsworth Mr D Ratcliffe Mr R Lees Mr R Ball Mr A Hewitt Mr J Hewitt Miss K Pickford-Avery				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO3198 PO3193 PO3188 PO3080 PO3075 PO3070 PO3298 PO3303 PO3390 PO3544 PO3533 PO3583 PO3252 PO3607 PO3572 PO3427 PO3586	Mrs P Routledge Mrs A Rogers Miss S Ford Ms J Croft Mr W Wordsworth Mr J Lawler Mrs J Birks Mr M Birks Helen Abbey Mrs Michelle Plant Mr Lee Plant Ms Gina Boston K W Alcock Mrs Patricia Allum Mr Lee Austin Mr Craig Beardmore Mr Matthew Boston						
PO3456 PO3453 PO3366 PO3342 PO3374 PO3318 PO3411 PO3403 PO3339 PO3268 PO3262 PO3398 PO3406 PO3292 PO3183 PO3065 PO3177 PO3060 PO3230 PO3111 PO3116 PO3121 PO3225 PO3273 PO3279 PO3284 PO3289 PO3419 PO3666 PO3631 PO3626	Mrs Susan Brindley Mr Darryl Brindley Mr Tommy Frost Mr Colin Hayes Mrs F R Hayward Mrs Mary Jones Mrs Brenda Mills Mr David Tavernor Mr S Waring Mrs J.F. Eaton Mr A.R. Eaton Mr Saul Cutler Mrs Sara Tavernor Mr D Renshaw Mrs P Wordsworth Mr C Foster Mr P Hollywood Mrs A Hollywood Mr N Hewitt Mr I Millward Miss P Millward Mr B Clare Mr P Heath Mr and Mrs A Brown Mr S Hassell Mrs C Moseley Mrs B Heesman Mr A Massey K W Alcock Mr N Brooks Mrs P Brooks				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO3461 PO3602 PO3437 PO3440 PO3506 PO3501 PO3577 PO3591 PO3523 PO3489 PO3514 PO3634 PO3486 PO3445	Mr D Campbell Mr K Davall Mr G Davall Mrs I Davall Mr R Dennis Mrs S Dennis Mrs K Drummond Mr A Drummond Mr J Edwards Mr M Elvidge Mrs Anne Fox Mrs Heather Frame Mr Frank Harding Mr Roger Johnson						
PO3477 PO3610 PO3561 PO3618 PO3674 PO3548 PO3615 PO3525 PO3569 PO3564 PO3594 PO3652 PO3497 PO3494 PO3509 PO3347 PO3472 PO3469 PO3517 PO3358 PO3371 PO3334 PO3332 PO3522 PO3553 PO3556 PO3387 PO3350 PO3639 PO3854 PO3661 PO3677 PO3682 PO3685	Mr & Mrs D Keates Mrs H Keeling Mr K Mannion Mr Darren Potts Mrs G Potts Mr & Mrs J & C Smith Mr David Thomas Maria Turley Mrs Jennifer Vasselin Miss Rachel Vasselin Mr K Weston Mr Kenneth Whitefield Mrs Avril Woodward Mr David Woodward M Stevenson Mr Christopher Jones Mr D Hancock Mrs J M Hancock Master J Kennaway Mr David Kennaway Mrs M E Nicholls Ms Allison Keates Mr Alan Keates Mr H J Gibson Mr John W Bossons Mrs R H Bossons Mr A Gough Mrs J Brown Mr D Renshaw Mr Philip Silk Mr and Mrs V M Elks Mr G Hodgkinson Mrs K Smith Mr I Crawford				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO3690 PO3698 PO3703 PO3706 PO3712 PO3714 PO3719 PO3724 PO3728 PO3733 PO3736 PO3741	Mrs J Crawford Mr JA Hayes Mr M Shirley Mr & Mrs M Nadova Mr P Cope Mrs J Cope Mr W Elks Mr D Richards Mr M Nad Ms T Janete Miss T Boulton Mrs J Saggars						
PO3744 PO3749 PO3757 PO3760 PO3765 PO3768 PO3776 PO3781 PO3784 PO3789 PO3792 PO3797 PO3800 PO3805 PO3809 PO3814 PO3817 PO3822 PO3825 PO3647 PO3830 PO3833 PO3838 PO3841 PO3846 PO3849 PO4792 PO4800 PO4815 PO4822 PO4780 PO4805 PO7468 PO7462 PO7456	Mr C Loving Mr T Loving Mrs C Hopkinson Mr and Mrs S Abbey Mrs P Richards Mr B Johnson Mrs J Richards Mr R Broad Miss E Clough Mr P Clough Mr G Barks Mr A Wilson Mr P Titterton Miss K Wilson Miss R Oulsnam Miss R Allen Miss J Seddon Mr A Fox Miss T Milward Mr K Pickin Mr A Millward Mr R Turley Mrs D Harrison Mr A Wright Mr D Tomkinson Mrs J Tomkinson Mr Richard Gallagher Jean Horsley Mrs Gillian Smith Ms Mary Walchester Mr & Mrs R & J Lovatt Mrs R Johnson Mr Jack Dempsey Ms Linda Powell Mr C Machin				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO3157 PO3172 PO3414 PO3323 PO3315	Mrs P Dunn Mr D Ratcliffe Mr Basil Brunt Mr Peter Brunt Mrs Hazel Brunt						
PO7075 PO7071	MRS PENNY PLANT Mr Alex Plant				Cheadle	Object	The housing allocation for Cheadle should be reduced to reflect the employment land allocation.
PO3379 PO3382 PO3326 PO3464 PO3395 PO3422 PO3363 PO3257 PO3355 PO3167 PO3127 PO3162	Mr Stanley Byatt Mrs Vera Byatt Mrs Jill Callear Mrs Joyce Campbell Miss L Chadwick Mrs Maureen Clewes Mr Harvey Cope Mr Roger Davis Mr David Fernihough Mr D Ainsworth Mr G Clewlow Mr D Dunn				Cheadle	Object	The employment land should be proportional to the housing allocation. In Leek and Biddulph this is the case, but for Cheadle and the Rural areas it is not. Cheadle is receiving a 2% higher housing allocation than employment land and visa versa for Rural Areas. I object to the housing allocation in Cheadle being higher than the amount of employment land available to support those houses. The housing allocation in Cheadle should therefore be reduced to 20%.
PO403	Mr David John Allen				General	Support	Generally support the allocation of employment sites. Would request that these are kept separate and not part of any mixed development.
PO1621	Mr John Steele				General	Object	Again the employment land requirement is based on an historical model which no longer holds true.
PO4393	Mr Andy Frost				General	Object	On behalf of our client, The Kemshead Family, we wish to make Representations in respect of a parcelt of land at the Mount, Leek. The aim is to secure the allocation of the entire site within their ownership for residential development in the emerging Local Plan. 320 homes per year across District (2012-2031) remains inadequate because it fails to support potential employment growth. [Proposed District employment land requirement should be increased for the reasons set out in Supporting Statement attached to Question 1]. For the reasons goven the Plan is therefore 'unsound' at present.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO9928	St Modwen Development Ltd	St Modwen Developments Limited	Ms Stacey Green	Barton Willmore	General	Object	Email containing letter and Evidence Report submitted [both attached to PO9838]: the range of additional employment land proposed is 25-45 ha to support the identified 320 homes per annum. we consider that the overall employment land requirement should be balanced against any increase in housing requirement. We also note that the Council has chosen to support a mid point within the range, at 35ha.This does not point to a Local Plan that is seeking to be aspirational or responsive to growth opportunities. The residual requirement for new employment land, after completions and commitments, is only 19.4ha across the District. Just 6.37ha is identified as the residual requirement for the rural areas, which includes Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook. [Section 5 of attached Evidence Report seeks clarity on the calculation of the residual land requirement of 19.4ha and also explore the risks of the Rural Areas delivery of employment land, given that only one site (Cresswell) is allocated to meet this need for the entire District]. SMD/2014/0576 draft allocation at Cresswell: B1/B2/B8 uses, amounting to 33,480 sqm of employment floorspace. However, this site is not being marketed and it is not clear how deliverable it is. Question its suitability and marketability as access to the A50 is relatively constrained. [Committe report refers to 'enabling' housing development to cross subsidise employment development. Scheme attracted Policy objections because Cresswell not spatial strategy village. By direct comparison, Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook is a Larger Village, already acknowledged with a role within the distribution of the Local Plan Housing Requirement, and [with proposed] new sites.. for housing development. The St Modwen site already benefits from an allocation, an extant planning permission and the case that St Modwen make for a mixed use scheme, with cross funding and enabling development is entirely consistent with the principles that underlie the recently approved Cresswell proposals. the employment allocation at Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook appears to be made in respect of serving a Regional Need, as opposed to local needs. However our view that the St Modwen site is well placed to accommodate and attract local requirements as well as strategic requirements. Moreover, we see both local and regional markets as complementary, rather than being mutually exclusive. Council state RIS ' may have a role to play in supporting the Northern Gateway Regeneration Initiative .’ Both Stoke Staffs+ Cheshire Warrington LEPS see this Zone as a potential opportunity to establish high economic and housing growth predicated on HS2 investment in the area. Senior officers from the LEP and composite LPAs attended MIPIM in October 2015 to boost the awareness of the Initiative. The unknown timescales, uncertainty of the Phase 2 HS2 station at Crewe/Stoke on Trent, funding and potential for the site to have the necessary strong links with HS2, mean that there is a disconnect between the aims of St Modwen to deliver development within the next five years on this site, and the potential for it to tie into a Gateway Initiative that is still within its fledging stages. The Blythe Vale site represents a scheme that has been identified, allocated and consented over a period of almost 30 years, as a site offering strategic potential..The site is yet to come forward however there are initiatives within the local area (i.e. HS2, the growth ambitions of the LEP) that will assist over a period of time. In order to prime this delivery, St Modwen are proposing a more favourable mix of uses on the site, to include a broadening of the B Use Classes and residential development to assist with the viability and delivery of the site. Our position that part of the site, and the land south of the A50 can still offer employment opportunities, however, in order to facilitate development occurring on this site within the next five years, and with certainty within this Plan Period to 2031, a broader mix of uses is more appropriate. However, delivery of the site has also been obstructed by the infrastructure required to service Phase 1 and the reliance Phase 2 places on the successful development of Phase 1. Phase 2 forms the most obvious location for any large inward investor. However it is effectively landlocked as we understand no direct access from the A50 is likely to be permitted. As such, the Development Brief requires a crossing by bridge (or bridges) from Phase 1 in order to access the Phase 2. The technical solution to create a robust A521 access to Phase 1, which has detailed planning permission, is expensive. Delivering this access requires up-front investment and despite a significant improvement in market conditions, the funding of industrial and office development remains challenging. This is evidenced by the relatively few speculative developments undertaken within the wider region recently. Without external funding, the development of the first phase for just B class uses is unlikely to be viable. Instead, other more valuable uses, such as residential (including affordable housing), a local centre and leisure (e.g. a pub/restaurant), are required in order to enable the traditional employment elements (i.e. B class) of the scheme. These uses can all be delivered without altering Green Belt boundaries.The mix of uses needed to fund the infrastructure requirements of the overall development of the first phase is currently being reviewed. St Modwen are wholly supportive of the development of this site, but consider [refer to Evidence Base Report] that a more attractive opportunity, that will deliver benefits to the local community of Blythe Bridge and Forsbrook, would be for a mixed use development comprising housing, employment and ancillary

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
							development.
PO901	Dr Anthony Shallcross				Hollington	General comment	Hollington is a working village with jobs in agriculture, quarrying and increasingly recreation and tourism. The main problem is that young people who were born in the village cannot afford to buy properties in the village. An affordable housing development and/or a relaxation of planning restrictions on building on homesteads (see Housing) would make the village a more vibrant community with a lower age profile.

Question 2 – Do you any comments regarding the proposed employment land requirement?

ID	Consultee Name	Company / Org	Agent Name	Agent Company / Org	Issue	Support / Object / General	Consultee Comments
PO3932	Mr Mike O Brien	WYG			Leek	Object	Refer to submitted Representations Report [attached to Question 1] which states: The Preferred Options document identifies a residual requirement for the delivery of up to 8.02ha of new employment land in Leek up until 2031. The proposed employment land allocations comprise 14.23ha, a significant surplus of 6.21ha over the residual requirement of 8.02ha. There is a clear and significant oversupply of employment land in Leek and therefore the loss of LE243 will have no detrimental impact on SMDC's employment strategy for Leek, particularly given the existing constraints; namely the residential location, access issues for HGV's and the proximity to playing fields and play area. The area strategy for Leek and subsequent allocations, as proposed within the Preferred Options Document, further support the lack of value of LE243 as an employment site. It is considered that [sites EM1 and EM2], as well as other in the south of the settlement as a whole offer much more appropriate opportunities for viable employment development in the future.
PO3922	Mr John Coxon	Emery Planning Partnership			Leekbrook	Object	Emery Planning is instructed by Wainhomes (North West) Limited to submit representations to the Preferred Option Site and Boundaries Consultation Booklet. The representations are made specifically with regard to our client 's site adjacent to Wardle Gardens, Leekbrook. [Refer to Report attached to Question 1 which also covers this question].
PO1278	Mr Yendole	Stafford Borough Council			Northern Gateway	Support	Stafford Borough Council has a border with Staffordshire Moorlands in the Cresswell and Blythe Bridge areas. A Regional Investment Site is proposed at Blythe Vale alongside the A50 to support the Northern Gateway regeneration initiative; Stafford Borough Council supports a focus on economic development in this locality through the Regional Investment Site, an employment allocation of 8.5 hectares proposed as an extension to Blythe Business Park at Cresswell as well as the Hadleigh Park Major Developed Site within Stafford Borough.