

Draft - Bagnall

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the Green Belt							
All Sites				<p>Bagnall PC comments:</p> <p>Letter dated 24 August 2015 – object to proposals set out in consultation document and refers back to meeting on the 9TH August 2015 where residents submitted petition to the PC. Letter also refers back to detailed objections in letter dated 12 August 2014. These are:</p> <p>Concentration of new build is like a mini estate and not compatible with character of village.</p> <p>PC not against development but this should be smaller developments more in character with village.</p> <p>Already barn conversions taking place and completion of 50 units at Bagnall Heights, with possible further development. This gives options for older residents to down size and free up housing stock.</p> <p>Sufficient development planned to meet 10 units.</p> <p>Miss communication from Council over proposed 15 units at Stockton Brook, in Bagnall Parish. This would meet housing requirements.</p> <p>Petition dated 11th August 2015 Signed by 143 residents. Objections are:</p> <p>Objecting to creating mini estates rather than more modest ribbon/infill development on the edge of the settlement.</p> <p>Lack of consultation with residents.</p> <p>Asks that the Parish Council supports their views opposing the 3 sites put forward.</p> <p>That the Parish Council clarifies with SMDC what new development can be counted towards housing target.</p>		Comments noted.	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
All sites				<p>Petition signed by 126 residents:</p> <p>Object to concept of mini estate and feel more modest infill/ribbon development more appropriate. Have far less impact on green field land, wildlife, residents, and infrastructure and maintain character of village.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure services and public transport.</p> <p>Conflicts with Core Strategy Policy T1 (reducing reliance on private cars).</p>		Comments noted.	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Parts of village and routes to neighbouring settlements without footpaths along narrow busy roads.</p> <p>There is no or little scope for growth in employment, economic diversification or tourism.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy SS6c seeks to maintain greenbelt. Supported by para 89 and 79 in NPPF.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Surface water in these areas should be treated using suitable SUDS where possible. If development is in a combined sewer area, increased flow should not affect the spill frequency.</p>			
BG008	10		0.83	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways - There is no current means off access into this site and it does not border a highway. Inspecting the area around the site it is unlikely, even if further land could be acquired, that an appropriate access could be provided.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - This site is in Bagnall Conservation Area and its use would be potentially harmful to its historic settlement form. In addition we were given to understand it will prove controversial: both it and the adjacent properties are owned by one family who are unlikely to sell.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Availability unknown.</p> <p>Public response 61 comments - 61 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Catchment schools oversubscribed. • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – School Road is narrow near misses with cars and pedestrians. No access to site and nearby lane would not be able to accommodate increased traffic. Access through fields or village hall car park inappropriate and dangerous. Public transport x2 per day times not compatible with commuters or schools. 2 narrow bridges in village not built to sustain heavy traffic. Often large vehicles hitting walls. . Access to the village from all direction along very narrow roads. Additional development adds to congestion. • Infrastructure – No facilities in Bagnall, buses, shops etc, doctors, post office only church and one pub. Private car travel required to reach services elsewhere. No access to main gas or drainage. No recreational or social amenities for elderly or 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of existing employment. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land and the district ecological importance of the site is likely to also have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has clearly raised issues about a suitable access to the site that may be difficult to overcome. • There are issues regarding the impact of any built development on this site on the Conservation Area which require careful consideration. • Staffordshire County Council say that Endon Hall Primary School currently has insufficient capacity for the likely number of pupils generated from the overall level of development in that catchment. Endon High School is also projected to have insufficient capacity and the District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. • 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). This study recommends that site BG008 is considered for release from the Green Belt. • The agricultural land classification of this land is grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>disabled. Existing drainage and sewerage at capacity.</p> <p>•Landscape – Object to building in greenbelt. Land used for cattle grazing and part of working dairy farm. Overdevelopment of rural location and impact on openness of village.</p> <p>•Nature Conservation – Site has a wide variety of wildlife such as bats, badgers, swifts, hares, newts and raptors all at risk if development occurs.</p> <p>•Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of far reaching views.</p> <p>•Scale of development – No estate style housing in village as this would ruin ribbon pattern of development in village. Development in centre of village should be avoided and develop on outlying open spaces might reduce impact on village.</p> <p>•Listed Building / Conservation Area – Site in conservation area.</p> <p>•Government Policy – Against govt policy to develop on greenbelt.</p> <p>•Other – Can you clarify how many houses are being proposed 30 or 10? Bagnall is historic village with sense of community development would undermine this. Cause noise, disruption and pollution at construction stage. Use brownfield sites in Stoke on Trent. 5 Other nearby properties under construction plus Endon riding school. This development should be counted towards housing quota as confirmed by SMDC at meeting on 21st July. Development would only be economically viable if developed as mini estate but this would change historic nature and character of village. Devalue properties. Owners have indicated site not available for housing.</p> <p>Petition submitted to Council indicates residents oppose estate type development and prefer infill. Infill options are; Clewloes Bank which is on land opposite Windycroft, and the areas of School Road between Fulwood and Bagnall Heights and between Casetta and Old Hall Farm. The advantages of infill between Bagnall Heights and the village would be to enhance links between this development and the village. There is no risk of drift towards the urban settlement of Stoke as natural and significant barriers already existing in the form of the golf course and cricket pitch.</p> <p>Ribbon development would have much less impact on the wildlife and green belt areas around the village. Study in 2009 revealed 800+ housing lay empty in SM. This has increased to 1350 (SMDC housing strategy 2013).Council would be better directing resources to occupying these.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • It is not agreed that 10 houses constitutes 'estate type development'. It is considered that design and layout are the key issues. Any new development taking place would be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The issue of using land in neighbouring authorities will be discussed as part of the Council's duty to co-operate obligation. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • The infill options suggested are within the Green Belt and are not recommended for consideration for release in the Green Belt Review. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				Chair of Bagnall PC has vested interest as owner of one of the 3 plots. Previously advised by SMDC that housing allocation was for the whole parish and not just village.			
BG014	10		1.16	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways - School Road is 30mph at this point and does have adequate pedestrian facilities. There is an existing gated farmland access leading directly into the site from School Road, however this would need improvements and widening to provide adequate dimension for an adoptable site road. There is no street lighting in the immediate vicinity along School Road, this would need to be addressed. Access could also be allowed through BG014 to BG015.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 50 comments - 49 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Schools at capacity • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Poor public transport and not at commuter times. Add to traffic on narrow network of roads. Access to the village from all direction along very narrow roads. Addition development adds to congestion. • Infrastructure - Other - No facilities in Bagnall, buses, shops, doctors, post office only church and one pub. Private transport required to get to facilities which are against SMDC Core Strategy. Cannot walk to these as footpaths few or narrow. No access to main gas, electric or drainage. No recreational or social amenities for elderly or disabled. Existing drainage and sewage at capacity. • Landscape – Destruction of greenbelt should be last resort. Change landscape character around village. • Nature Conservation – Site is former AONB also contains or is adjacent to wetlands and home to wildlife. Development would impact on water table. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of privacy, light, increased noise and loss of open aspect/views to properties that will back onto the site. • Scale of development – To build cluster of houses would be out of character with village. Development along School Road or ribbon development would be better less infrastructure required and more in keeping with village. • Listed Building / Conservation Area – Site is in conservation area building a mini estate would change 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of existing employment. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land and the district ecological importance of the site is likely to also have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would make this site undevelopable. • Staffordshire County Council say that Endon Hall Primary School currently has insufficient capacity for the likely number of pupils generated from the overall level of development in that catchment. Endon High School is also projected to have insufficient capacity and the District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. • 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). This study recommends that site BG014 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>character of village.</p> <p>•Government Policy - Against govt policy to develop on greenbelt</p> <p>•Other Previously advised by SMDC that housing allocation was for the whole parish and not just village. Devalue property. Housing in village slow to sell. No existing business capable of expansion requiring additional housing. Brownfield sites available to develop in cities. Question the viability of developing site for such small number of housing with lack of infrastructure would need to be larger estate to be viable. Already 3 dwellings being built in village so housing requirement should be 7 not 10. These could be accommodated on small sites in village being brought forward on an incremental basis.</p> <p>Infill options are; Clewloes Bank which is on land opposite Windycroft, and the areas of School Road between Fulwood and Bagnall Heights and between Casetta and Old Hall Farm. The advantages of infill would be to enhance links between this development and the village. There is no risk of drift towards the urban settlement of Stoke as natural and significant barriers already existing in the form of the golf course and cricket pitch.</p> <p>No evidence for housing numbers and recent figures show over 1000 properties lie vacant in SM. Given opposition of locals and PC – Neighbourhood Plan for Bagnall? Settlement area does not reflect the full community (excluding Bagnall Heights, houses along School Rd and behind Fulwood and land at the top of Clewloes Bank towards Bagnall springs). Why are these areas excluded from settlement? Plans for other Staffordshire villages include outlying areas.</p> <p>5 recently completed developments plus additional development of Bagnall Heights means 5 houses required not 10.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>•Other – owner of part of sites supports development but no reasons given.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not agreed that 10 houses would be out of character with the village. It is considered that design and layout are the key issues. Any new development taking place would be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The site adjoins the Conservation Area but is not within it. • 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. • The issue of using land in neighbouring authorities will be discussed as part of the Council's duty to co-operate obligation. • There is no indication at this stage that development of this site would be unviable. • The infill options suggested are within the Green Belt and are not recommended for consideration for release in the Green Belt Review. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. 	
BG015	10		0.66	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways - As mentioned in comments to BG014, BG014 and BG015 if developed together, could have an acceptable access, although improvements would be required via the existing gated entrance directly off School Road. If developed in isolation, however the only means of access is via a private driveway. Considering the potential number of properties which could be accommodated on this site it is unlikely that an adopted</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of existing employment. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would make this site undevelopable, though it is accepted that access through neighbouring BG014 would be required. • Staffordshire County Council say that Endon Hall Primary School currently has insufficient capacity for the likely number of pupils generated from the overall level of 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>road could be provided over the constraints of this driveway.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 56 comments – 56 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Schools oversubscribed • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport - Poor public transport. Access to the village from all directions along very narrow roads. Additional development adds to congestion. Need to travel by private car to reach services which is against SMDC Core Strategy. Cannot walk to services as footpaths narrow in places. Poor access to site. • Infrastructure – Other No facilities in Bagnall, buses, shops etc, doctors, post office only church and one pub. All require private transport. No access to main gas, electric or drainage. No recreational or social amenities for elderly or disabled. Existing drainage and sewerage at capacity. • Landscape – Destruction of greenbelt should be last resort. Part of working dairy farm. • Nature Conservation - Site is former AONB also contains or is adjacent to wetlands and home to wildlife. Development would impact on wildlife and water table. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of privacy, increase noise and pollution and loss of open aspect/views. • Scale of development - To build cluster of houses would be out of character with village. Development along school road/infill development would be better less infrastructure required and more in keeping with village. Better infill sites in village available which could be brought forward on an incremental basis. • Listed Building / Conservation Area – Site is in conservation area. • Government Policy - Against govt policy to develop on greenbelt • Other Previously advised by SMDC that housing allocation was for the whole parish and not just village. Devalue property. No evidence for housing numbers and recent figures show over 1000 properties lie vacant in SM. Given opposition of locals and PC – Neighbourhood Plan for Bagnall? No existing business in Bagnall capable of expansion and therefore requiring more housing. Brownfield sites in Stoke available for development. Question the viability of developing site for such a small number of housing and lack of infrastructure means 	<p>is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land and the district ecological importance of the site is likely to also have a negative effect.</p>	<p>development in that catchment. Endon High School is also projected to have insufficient capacity and the District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. • 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). This study recommends that site BG015 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. • The agricultural land classification of this land is grade 4 which means that it is poor quality. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • It is not agreed that 10 houses would be out of character with the village. It is considered that design and layout are the key issues. Any new development taking place would be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The land is adjacent to but not within the Conservation Area. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>development would need to be larger estate.</p> <p>Infill options are; Clewloes Bank which is on land opposite Windycroft, and the areas of School Road between Fulwood and Bagnall Heights and between Casetta and Old Hall Farm. The advantages of infill would be to enhance links between this development and the village. There is no risk of drift towards the urban settlement of Stoke as natural and significant barriers already existing in the form of the golf course and cricket pitch.</p> <p>Settlement area does not reflect the full community (excluding Bagnall Heights, houses along School Rd and behind Fulwood and land at the top of Clewloes Bank towards Bagnall springs).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The issue of using land in neighbouring authorities will be discussed as part of the Council's duty to co-operate obligation. • There is no indication at this stage that development of this site would be unviable. • The infill options suggested are within the Green Belt and are not recommended for consideration for release in the Green Belt Review. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. 	

Draft - Blackshaw Moor

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites outside the draft infill boundary							
							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
BL006	12		0.73	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: Plot is not directly connected to highway. Access beyond Bluestones Close will require widening and bringing up to adoptable standard, including provision of footway. Surface water runoff from the farm track will need to be considered.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - This site extends too far out of the draft infill boundary and abuts the School which would prevent the school from extending in this direction. As the viability of rural schools is one of the arguments being used for the creation of infill boundaries for the smaller settlements this seems to be an important consideration.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner confirms that most of this site is available for housing.</p> <p>Public response 0 comments.</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 12 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of existing employment. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land and the district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. Staffordshire County Education Authority advise that there is currently some spare capacity at Blackshaw Moor CE First School and that the small number of homes proposed in Blackshaw Moor should not impact significantly on this school. Additional school places are unlikely to be needed to mitigate the impact of this scale of development in the area. Neither do they reference the need for extending the school playing fields. 	Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
BL007	7		0.20	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: acceptable subject to access design and visibility. Footway or service strip should be provided on frontage of plot.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner has confirmed that this site is not available for future development.</p> <p>Public response 0 comments.</p>	The site's accessibility to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. The proposed delivery of 7 dwellings is likely to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. 	

Draft - Caverswall

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation	
Sites within infill boundary								
				<p>Caverswall Parish Council - All sites - Village should not be split into two areas. Already has 13 of the required 20 houses with another 7 dwellings being achievable through infill.</p> <p>Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient capacity within the Leek and Checkley treatment works to support growth. However there are known sewer capacity issues with the main sewer from Draycott to Checkley STW. Checkley sewage treatment works serves Caverswall. Surface water in these areas should be treated using suitable SUDS where possible. If development is in a combined sewer area, increased flow should not affect the spill frequency. 				Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
CV005	10		0.63	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site is in conservation area and greenbelt and within curtilage of several listed buildings. There is a spring on the site which is known to cause flooding. Access is onto narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways - (CV004, CV005) The Hollow has no footway and is unlit. Access off The Hollow would be difficult due to levels which could prevent improvements, currently only a farm access on the eastern side of the site which is not suitable for the numbers proposed without improvements. Access does not seem possible to High Street.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner unknown.</p> <p>Public response 28 comments - 28 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – schools - schools at capacity and children will have to travel further to school No parking for schools Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Parking an issue on High Street 'access only' especially at school times and also in the Square and Hollows. Traffic congestion will increase. Caverswall High Street is a single track road unable to take increased traffic. Site is close to both primary schools and cause access 	The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. The Highway Authority has raised access difficulties which appear to be challenging to overcome. 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. 		

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>and traffic difficulties especially at drop off and pick up times. People outside of the village do not observe traffic restrictions. A development would have difficulty in accessing the site from the High Street. A previous application for this site was turned down by SMDC. Few pavements within village. Road improvements must be considered to meet extra housing. Access would destroy old farmyard entrance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other – cannot take any more development. No shops, doctors, dentists etc. Poor public transport. How will drains cope with extra sewage and water. More housing means more demands on local services and facilities. • Landscape – This site is greenbelt in heart of the village and will spoil rural feel and make it more like an estate. The site provides landscape for those with very small back gardens. It would also detract greatly from the 'rurality' of the village • Nature conservation – Impact on flora and fauna and wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of outlook and views. Impact on quality of life for nearby residents. • Flood risk – Natural spring on site known to cause flooding. • Scale of development – More development will erode historic charm of village. Impact on character of village. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by existing infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Always plenty of properties for sale in the village. Lots of open space more suitable to build on. Already new housing built in village recently. People want to live in village – this is reflected in prices paid for property. Devalue house prices. This is one community and housing requirements should be amended to reflect this. There is sufficient infill and space in the existing village boundary to meet housing requirements. There are several new development priced highly that have not sold. Affordable housing is required for young and older residents to down size and free up family sized homes. Develop empty buildings and brownfield sites first. Few play facilities for children. Village is conservation area with several listed buildings 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				in village square and has a protected linear aspect. Building would destroy this. Right of way across field. Historic character spoilt by modern development.			
Sites within the Green Belt							
CV004	8		0.36	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site lies outside of draft new infill boundary. It is greenbelt and pastureland. It is outside village boundary. Access is onto a narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways – (CV004, CV005) The Hollow has no footway and is unlit. Access off The Hollow would be difficult due to levels which could prevent improvements, currently only a farm access on the eastern side of the site which is not suitable for the numbers proposed without improvements. Access does not seem possible to High Street.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner unknown.</p> <p>Public response 31 comments - 31 objections</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – At capacity and children having to travel outside of area. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Increase in traffic and roads already used as short cut and rat run. Existing roads are unsuitable for more traffic and no room to alter. Access to the site is on a tight bend and would create additional traffic problems and have devastating visual impact. Site is close to both primary schools and cause access and traffic difficulties especially at drop off and pick up times. People outside of the village do not observe traffic restrictions. Parking is already bad along High Street. Very few pavements in the village. Cannot see how you can provide access to this field. • Infrastructure – other – few shops and public transport no doctors, dentists etc. • Landscape – The area is greenbelt in heart of village and should not be developed into housing estate. Infringement on greenbelt and will be swallowed into Stoke on Trent conurbation. Green spaces are part of the character of the village. • Nature conservation – Protect natural environment and wildlife. Loose established trees and wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Taking away open views. Increase in noise pollution. • Flood risk – Loose natural drainage on the site. • Scale of development – Spoil the feel of the village 	The proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and low ecological value of the site is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Caverswall to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 CV004 for release from the Green Belt. • The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. • The Highway Authority has raised access difficulties which appear to be challenging to overcome. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>and more like urban estate. Fundamental change to rural landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Devalue property that owners paid premium to live in village. Already 13 new homes in the village this year (Cloisters) very high prices and not selling. This needs to be taken into account with regards to housing numbers required. Village needs affordable housing and options to downsize therefore releasing family homes onto market and keeping opportunities for young and old to stay in village. There are other open spaces more suitable to build on. Village is a conservation area. Caverswall and Cookshill should be treated as one village and housing allocations should be amended accordingly. Existing old and new housing is not selling. More houses means drain on existing amenities ie play areas. Funds will be required to improve these. Enough infill potential in village to develop small number of housing required. Few play facilities for children. Ancient linear village with several listed buildings building on this land would destroy linear aspect. There is a public footpath through the site. Modern development ruin distinct village feel. 		<p>sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	
CV006	8		0.40	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site is in conservation area and greenbelt and within curtilage of several listed buildings. There is a spring on the site which is known to cause flooding. Access is onto narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways - High Street has no footways and is an access only to prevent rat-running, unlikely to achieve visibility for an adoptable road. The land is currently used for garden and parking at the moment where land abuts the High Street. There also appears to be two other accesses into the land which could be investigated. 8 units would be too many off a single access. Individual units with access and parking maybe achievable.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner intentions unknown.</p> <p>Public response 25 comments - 25 objections</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Schools at capacity. • Infrastructure – traffic/transport – Traffic will increase through village and no scope to improve road 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Caverswall to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 CV006 for release from the Green Belt. • The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. • The Highway Authority has identified an access issue which would need to be resolved if this site is to be delivered. • 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 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>structure. How will the site be accessed? Parking is already an issue on High Street 'access only' Traffic nightmare at school times. Access to site would impact on privacy. Few pavements in village. Levels of traffic high through village as used as short cut. Road improvements must be undertaken to meet new housing. Access through Red house car park or High Street both busy and cannot take any more traffic. Infrastructure – other – Drain on existing facilities. No shops, doctors dentists etc and poor public transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape – building on greenbelt is unacceptable. This is greenbelt in the heart of the village. Greenbelt adds to the character of the village. • Nature conservation – need to protect wildlife. Development would impact on wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Taking away open views. Access route would impact on privacy. • Flood risk – natural spring in site that causes flooding. • Scale of development – spoil rural feel of village more like housing estate. Housing numbers should be amended to reflect that this is one community. Scale of development is inappropriate for village of this size. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – There are other open spaces more suitable for building. Already have new homes in the village which have not sold. Residents have paid a premium to live in village house prices will be devalued. Always properties for sale in village. Existing village boundary and infill development would meet housing needs especially given recent new developments which are priced high. Village needs affordable housing and options to downsize therefore releasing family homes onto market and keeping opportunities for young and old to stay in village. Village retains strong traditional feel with good community values. Build on the outskirts of the village i.e. old nursery site. Number of dwellings proposed is above level anticipated for next 16 years. Do not want to be swallowed into Stoke on Trent conurbation. Few play facilities for children.. Village is a conservation area with protected ridge and furrow fields etc. 		<p>growth at the Primary and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Caverswall has linear aspect to development which needs to be protected.</p> <p>Site lies within curtilage of several listed buildings.</p> <p>Change character of village from historic and picturesque into one surrounded by modern development.</p> <p>New houses would be viewed from village green ruin the feel and views of the village.</p>			

Draft - Cookshill

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
None							
Sites within the Green Belt							
CL004	20		2.20	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - This is green belt and pastureland. Access to site on blind bend. Site is located in curtilage of listed building. Public footpath through site.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Access to site will be difficult on Roughcote Lane, as there no footways to the east so unlikely to achieve adequate visibility without improvements to third party land.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner - Landowner intentions unknown.</p> <p>Public response 37 comments - 36 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Local primary schools at capacity and no pre-school facilities. Children have to travel adding to congestion. No parking for schools. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Access to site unsuitable and road network around narrow, blind bends and unsafe Green lane used as rat run. Devt here add to more congestion and accidents. Public transport inadequate. Access from Roughcote Lane will require tress and hedges to be removed. Limited visibility at Roughcote lane and Mill Close. Additional housing means increased traffic using the Green. Green Carriageway is unacceptable with no pavements for 80%. Road junction at Auctioneers Arms is dangerous. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 20 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from historic assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Cookshill to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary is likely to need adjustment 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 CL004 for release from the Green Belt. • The Highway Authority has raised an issue with accessing the site which would need to be resolved. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Narrow pavements outside of school and school pick up/drop off = congestion in village. There will be an increased use of Caverswall Rd and School Lane as 'rat run' thus avoiding Meir. Village used as short cut by people living outside the area. Access only restrictions are already not observed. Construction traffic will cause major disruption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other – only one small shop and nearest GP is in Meir. Inadequate local facilities –no dentist doctors or health clinic • Landscape – Site used as agricultural, greenbelt, farmland and should stay that way. Public footpath across site and 100 year old trees which are central to aesthetics of the landscape. Land is greenbelt. Field provides pleasant outlook. Retention of greenbelt is a must to retain the character of the village. • Nature conservation – large number of birds breeding nearby will be impacted by devt. Impact upon protected wildlife. • Flooding – Flooding on School Land and The Green after heavy rain. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light)- increase in noise and lack of privacy. Loss of quiet and pleasant outlook. • Scale of development – Number of houses unreasonable and recent devt at The Cloisters and Wesleyan Chapel slow to sell. What Caverswall needs is affordable housing. Existing village boundary and infill capacity will meet housing requirements. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Better to build near scout hut CL007. Housing allocation should reflect that this is one community. Increase in traffic pollution. Caverswall and Cookshill should be considered as one village for the purposes of the Local Devt Plan. Devalue property. Loss of perfectly good arable farming land. Plenty of houses for sale in village. People want to live here because it is a tranquil village not housing estate. Few play facilities for children. Site within curtilage of listed building. Footpath running through site. Site is flat and good for agriculture. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools - Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Road structure from Weston Coyney 		<p>Settlement Setting Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>would cope with extra traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) • Scale of development – Houses would blend in better as already sizeable estate already there. Development kept to min number to retain village feel. 			
CL007	30		0.98	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Previous application refused on site and dismissed at appeal as important spatial land between authorities. Land is on food plain and greenbelt. Increased risk of sewer surcharge into existing and new houses. 30 houses is over development of the site.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Access to site should be acceptable onto Caverswall Lane. A 2 metre wide footway would be required over the site frontage. Traffic calming could be required on Caverswall Road depending on the what the existing 85 percentile speeds are, which would be a continuation of School Lane.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 28 comments - 27 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Schools at capacity and children having to travel adding to congestion. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – routes around village already congested and used as rat run cannot cope with more housing. Already difficult to walk safely to the site. Narrow pavements outside of school. Junction at Auctioneers Arms and exit at Mill Close is dangerous. Existing traffic restrictions are not observed. Junction of School Lane and The Green lethal. If development goes ahead then road improvements are required. Access to the site borders narrow road next to primary school and highly unsuitable for additional traffic. • Infrastructure – other – No local doctors only 1 shop and public transport is inadequate. Additional houses will put a strain on local facilities. • Landscape - This is a major incursion into the small strip of greenbelt between Caverswall and Stoke-on-Trent conurbation. Previous plans to develop have been turned down by Council and the Government Inspector because of the importance of maintaining this separation. Land is greenbelt and spatial land that separates 2 County Councils. Building here would link village to Weston Coyney. Site is used as farmland and should stay that way. • Nature conservation – Impact on wildlife. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 30 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The district ecological importance of the site and its proximity to historic assets is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Cookshill to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 that site CL007 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. • The Highway Authority does not raise any issues which would preclude the development of this site. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenities – issues such as overlooking and loss of 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Residents on Mill Close will be overlooked. Noise pollution. Impact on privacy and natural light. • Flood Risk – Junction of School Lane and the Green Floods after heavy rain. Site prone to flooding. The land is on a flood plain. • Scale of development – Affordable housing needed. Affordable housing is out of keeping with the village and will be more housing estate than rural village. The site is small compared to number of dwellings proposed. Height of development overbearing. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. Number of houses is more than is required. • Other – No more housing until new developments are sold. This is one village that shares facilities and housing numbers should reflect this. Site is next to scout hut and bus stop which is dangerous. Cars not adhering to speed restrictions make it very dangerous. Site is outside current infill boundary. Few play facilities for children. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools - Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Road between Cookshill and Weston Coyney would support extra housing. • Infrastructure – other • Scale of development – Hope that development remains small and sit alongside properties of a similar design and does not ruin village feel. 		<p>light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Draft – Caverswall and Cookshill

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation	
Sites within infill boundary								
				<p>Caverswall Parish Council - All sites - Village should not be split into two areas. Already has 13 of the required 20 houses with another 7 dwellings being achievable through infill.</p> <p>Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient capacity within the Leek and Checkley treatment works to support growth. However there are known sewer capacity issues with the main sewer from Draycott to Checkley STW. Checkley sewage treatment works serves Caverswall. Surface water in these areas should be treated using suitable SUDS where possible. If development is in a combined sewer area, increased flow should not affect the spill frequency. 				Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
CV005	10		0.63	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site is in conservation area and greenbelt and within curtilage of several listed buildings. There is a spring on the site which is known to cause flooding. Access is onto narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways - (CV004, CV005) The Hollow has no footway and is unlit. Access off The Hollow would be difficult due to levels which could prevent improvements, currently only a farm access on the eastern side of the site which is not suitable for the numbers proposed without improvements. Access does not seem possible to High Street.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner unknown.</p> <p>Public response 28 comments - 28 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – schools - schools at capacity and children will have to travel further to school No parking for schools Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Parking an issue on High Street ‘access only’ especially at school times and also in the Square and Hollows. Traffic congestion will increase. Caverswall High Street is a single track road unable to take increased traffic. Site is close to both primary schools and cause access 	The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. The Highway Authority has raised access difficulties which appear to be challenging to overcome. 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. 		

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>and traffic difficulties especially at drop off and pick up times. People outside of the village do not observe traffic restrictions. A development would have difficulty in accessing the site from the High Street. A previous application for this site was turned down by SMDC. Few pavements within village. Road improvements must be considered to meet extra housing. Access would destroy old farmyard entrance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other – cannot take any more development. No shops, doctors, dentists etc. Poor public transport. How will drains cope with extra sewage and water. More housing means more demands on local services and facilities. • Landscape – This site is greenbelt in heart of the village and will spoil rural feel and make it more like an estate. The site provides landscape for those with very small back gardens. It would also detract greatly from the 'rurality' of the village • Nature conservation – Impact on flora and fauna and wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of outlook and views. Impact on quality of life for nearby residents. • Flood risk – Natural spring on site known to cause flooding. • Scale of development – More development will erode historic charm of village. Impact on character of village. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by existing infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Always plenty of properties for sale in the village. Lots of open space more suitable to build on. Already new housing built in village recently. People want to live in village – this is reflected in prices paid for property. Devalue house prices. This is one community and housing requirements should be amended to reflect this. There is sufficient infill and space in the existing village boundary to meet housing requirements. There are several new development priced highly that have not sold. Affordable housing is required for young and older residents to down size and free up family sized homes. Develop empty buildings and brownfield sites first. Few play facilities for children. Village is conservation area with several listed buildings 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				in village square and has a protected linear aspect. Building would destroy this. Right of way across field. Historic character spoilt by modern development.			
Sites within the Green Belt							
CV004	8		0.36	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site lies outside of draft new infill boundary. It is greenbelt and pastureland. It is outside village boundary. Access is onto a narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways – (CV004, CV005) The Hollow has no footway and is unlit. Access off The Hollow would be difficult due to levels which could prevent improvements, currently only a farm access on the eastern side of the site which is not suitable for the numbers proposed without improvements. Access does not seem possible to High Street.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner unknown.</p> <p>Public response 31 comments - 31 objections</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – At capacity and children having to travel outside of area. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Increase in traffic and roads already used as short cut and rat run. Existing roads are unsuitable for more traffic and no room to alter. Access to the site is on a tight bend and would create additional traffic problems and have devastating visual impact. Site is close to both primary schools and cause access and traffic difficulties especially at drop off and pick up times. People outside of the village do not observe traffic restrictions. Parking is already bad along High Street. Very few pavements in the village. Cannot see how you can provide access to this field. • Infrastructure – other – few shops and public transport no doctors, dentists etc. • Landscape – The area is greenbelt in heart of village and should not be developed into housing estate. Infringement on greenbelt and will be swallowed into Stoke on Trent conurbation. Green spaces are part of the character of the village. • Nature conservation – Protect natural environment and wildlife. Loose established trees and wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Taking away open views. Increase in noise pollution. • Flood risk – Loose natural drainage on the site. • Scale of development – Spoil the feel of the village 	The proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and low ecological value of the site is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Caverswall to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 CV004 for release from the Green Belt. • The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. • The Highway Authority has raised access difficulties which appear to be challenging to overcome. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>and more like urban estate. Fundamental change to rural landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Devalue property that owners paid premium to live in village. Already 13 new homes in the village this year (Cloisters) very high prices and not selling. This needs to be taken into account with regards to housing numbers required. Village needs affordable housing and options to downsize therefore releasing family homes onto market and keeping opportunities for young and old to stay in village. There are other open spaces more suitable to build on. Village is a conservation area. Caverswall and Cookshill should be treated as one village and housing allocations should be amended accordingly. Existing old and new housing is not selling. More houses means drain on existing amenities ie play areas. Funds will be required to improve these. Enough infill potential in village to develop small number of housing required. Few play facilities for children. Ancient linear village with several listed buildings building on this land would destroy linear aspect. There is a public footpath through the site. Modern development ruin distinct village feel. 		<p>sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	
CV006	8		0.40	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Site is in conservation area and greenbelt and within curtilage of several listed buildings. There is a spring on the site which is known to cause flooding. Access is onto narrow lane.</p> <p>SCC Highways - High Street has no footways and is an access only to prevent rat-running, unlikely to achieve visibility for an adoptable road. The land is currently used for garden and parking at the moment where land abuts the High Street. There also appears to be two other accesses into the land which could be investigated. 8 units would be too many off a single access. Individual units with access and parking maybe achievable.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner intentions unknown.</p> <p>Public response 25 comments - 25 objections</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Schools at capacity. • Infrastructure – traffic/transport – Traffic will increase through village and no scope to improve road 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and the site's proximity to historic assets. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Caverswall to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 CV006 for release from the Green Belt. • The site is within the Conservation area and considered to be potentially harmful to the settlement form by the Council's Conservation team. • The Highway Authority has identified an access issue which would need to be resolved if this site is to be delivered. • 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 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>structure. How will the site be accessed? Parking is already an issue on High Street 'access only' Traffic nightmare at school times. Access to site would impact on privacy. Few pavements in village. Levels of traffic high through village as used as short cut. Road improvements must be undertaken to meet new housing. Access through Red house car park or High Street both busy and cannot take any more traffic. Infrastructure – other – Drain on existing facilities. No shops, doctors dentists etc and poor public transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape – building on greenbelt is unacceptable. This is greenbelt in the heart of the village. Greenbelt adds to the character of the village. • Nature conservation – need to protect wildlife. Development would impact on wildlife. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Taking away open views. Access route would impact on privacy. • Flood risk – natural spring in site that causes flooding. • Scale of development – spoil rural feel of village more like housing estate. Housing numbers should be amended to reflect that this is one community. Scale of development is inappropriate for village of this size. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – There are other open spaces more suitable for building. Already have new homes in the village which have not sold. Residents have paid a premium to live in village house prices will be devalued. Always properties for sale in village. Existing village boundary and infill development would meet housing needs especially given recent new developments which are priced high. Village needs affordable housing and options to downsize therefore releasing family homes onto market and keeping opportunities for young and old to stay in village. Village retains strong traditional feel with good community values. Build on the outskirts of the village i.e. old nursery site. Number of dwellings proposed is above level anticipated for next 16 years. Do not want to be swallowed into Stoke on Trent conurbation. Few play facilities for children.. Village is a conservation area with protected ridge and furrow fields etc. 		<p>growth at the Primary and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Caverswall has linear aspect to development which needs to be protected.</p> <p>Site lies within curtilage of several listed buildings.</p> <p>Change character of village from historic and picturesque into one surrounded by modern development.</p> <p>New houses would be viewed from village green ruin the feel and views of the village.</p>			

Draft - Cookshill

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
None							
Sites within the Green Belt							
CL004	20		2.20	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - This is green belt and pastureland. Access to site on blind bend. Site is located in curtilage of listed building. Public footpath through site.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Access to site will be difficult on Roughcote Lane, as there no footways to the east so unlikely to achieve adequate visibility without improvements to third party land.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner - Landowner intentions unknown.</p> <p>Public response 37 comments - 36 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Local primary schools at capacity and no pre-school facilities. Children have to travel adding to congestion. No parking for schools. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – Access to site unsuitable and road network around narrow, blind bends and unsafe Green lane used as rat run. Devt here add to more congestion and accidents. Public transport inadequate. Access from Roughcote Lane will require tress and hedges to be removed. Limited visibility at Roughcote lane and Mill Close. Additional housing means increased traffic using the Green. Green Carriageway is unacceptable with no pavements for 80%. Road junction at Auctioneers Arms is dangerous. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 20 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from historic assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The district ecological importance of the site is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Cookshill to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary is likely to need adjustment 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 CL004 for release from the Green Belt. • The Highway Authority has raised an issue with accessing the site which would need to be resolved. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Narrow pavements outside of school and school pick up/drop off = congestion in village. There will be an increased use of Caverswall Rd and School Lane as 'rat run' thus avoiding Meir. Village used as short cut by people living outside the area. Access only restrictions are already not observed. Construction traffic will cause major disruption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other – only one small shop and nearest GP is in Meir. Inadequate local facilities –no dentist doctors or health clinic • Landscape – Site used as agricultural, greenbelt, farmland and should stay that way. Public footpath across site and 100 year old trees which are central to aesthetics of the landscape. Land is greenbelt. Field provides pleasant outlook. Retention of greenbelt is a must to retain the character of the village. • Nature conservation – large number of birds breeding nearby will be impacted by devt. Impact upon protected wildlife. • Flooding – Flooding on School Land and The Green after heavy rain. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light)- increase in noise and lack of privacy. Loss of quiet and pleasant outlook. • Scale of development – Number of houses unreasonable and recent devt at The Cloisters and Wesleyan Chapel slow to sell. What Caverswall needs is affordable housing. Existing village boundary and infill capacity will meet housing requirements. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. • Other – Better to build near scout hut CL007. Housing allocation should reflect that this is one community. Increase in traffic pollution. Caverswall and Cookshill should be considered as one village for the purposes of the Local Devt Plan. Devalue property. Loss of perfectly good arable farming land. Plenty of houses for sale in village. People want to live here because it is a tranquil village not housing estate. Few play facilities for children. Site within curtilage of listed building. Footpath running through site. Site is flat and good for agriculture. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools - Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Road structure from Weston Coyney 		<p>Settlement Setting Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>would cope with extra traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – other • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) • Scale of development – Houses would blend in better as already sizeable estate already there. Development kept to min number to retain village feel. 			
CL007	30		0.98	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Caverswall Parish Council - Previous application refused on site and dismissed at appeal as important spatial land between authorities. Land is on food plain and greenbelt. Increased risk of sewer surcharge into existing and new houses. 30 houses is over development of the site.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Access to site should be acceptable onto Caverswall Lane. A 2 metre wide footway would be required over the site frontage. Traffic calming could be required on Caverswall Road depending on the what the existing 85 percentile speeds are, which would be a continuation of School Lane.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 28 comments - 27 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – schools – Schools at capacity and children having to travel adding to congestion. • Infrastructure - traffic/transport – routes around village already congested and used as rat run cannot cope with more housing. Already difficult to walk safely to the site. Narrow pavements outside of school. Junction at Auctioneers Arms and exit at Mill Close is dangerous. Existing traffic restrictions are not observed. Junction of School Lane and The Green lethal. If development goes ahead then road improvements are required. Access to the site borders narrow road next to primary school and highly unsuitable for additional traffic. • Infrastructure – other – No local doctors only 1 shop and public transport is inadequate. Additional houses will put a strain on local facilities. • Landscape - This is a major incursion into the small strip of greenbelt between Caverswall and Stoke-on-Trent conurbation. Previous plans to develop have been turned down by Council and the Government Inspector because of the importance of maintaining this separation. Land is greenbelt and spatial land that separates 2 County Councils. Building here would link village to Weston Coyney. Site is used as farmland and should stay that way. • Nature conservation – Impact on wildlife. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 30 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The district ecological importance of the site and its proximity to historic assets is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Cookshill to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment 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 that site CL007 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. • The Highway Authority does not raise any issues which would preclude the development of this site. • 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 and Secondary phases of education within the catchment. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The land in question is not highlighted as significant in the Council's Landscape & Settlement Setting Assessment. • The Council has recently 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 can be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • Amenities – issues such as overlooking and loss of 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Residents on Mill Close will be overlooked. Noise pollution. Impact on privacy and natural light. • Flood Risk – Junction of School Lane and the Green Floods after heavy rain. Site prone to flooding. The land is on a flood plain. • Scale of development – Affordable housing needed. Affordable housing is out of keeping with the village and will be more housing estate than rural village. The site is small compared to number of dwellings proposed. Height of development overbearing. • Government policy – Govt directive asks for 20 houses in small villages. We already have 13 new and therefore only 7 required by 2031. This could be provided by infill and more barn conversions whilst preserving our heritage. Number of houses is more than is required. • Other – No more housing until new developments are sold. This is one village that shares facilities and housing numbers should reflect this. Site is next to scout hut and bus stop which is dangerous. Cars not adhering to speed restrictions make it very dangerous. Site is outside current infill boundary. Few play facilities for children. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools - Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Road between Cookshill and Weston Coyney would support extra housing. • Infrastructure – other • Scale of development – Hope that development remains small and sit alongside properties of a similar design and does not ruin village feel. 		<p>light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permissions which have been granted since 2011 will be included in the village's housing requirements. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. • Public footpaths can be maintained or re-directed. 	

Draft - Checkley

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
None							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
Sites outside the infill boundary							
CK007	6		0.28	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Checkley Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – the main road from Uttoxeter and two JCB sites to Tean/Cheadle pass through Checkley. This road is straight through Checkley and is a frequent high speed overtaking area. Checkley is also on the diversion route used if the A50 is closed between Uttoxeter and Blythe Bridge. Access to the sites. Fear of houses overlooking each other. Area is prone to flooding, main sewer is at capacity. Local schools are already at capacity. Both of these sites are green field sites. Fole dairy would make a better site. <p>Checkley Village Awareness Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for development at the Fole Dairy site rather than CK007. This will meet housing requirement. Brownfield sites and infill should be utilised first Rural Village character should be preserved. Development will place enormous pressure on amenities Sites identified are excessive for five houses. Sites selected front a very busy road and accident blackspot Issues with existing electricity supply. Loss of two fields will impact on environment and Countryside. <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splay. Bus stop on frontage should be protected, renewed and upgraded if appropriate.</p> <p>SCC Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and low ecological value is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The site's proximity to historic assets is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Council will work with the County Council to identify appropriate solutions regarding education provision. County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splay Housing commitments between 2011-2015 will be factored in to calculate the village's residual housing requirement to 2031. Note that not all options are likely to be required to meet Checkley's requirements. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including SMDC Conservation, SCC Highways/Transportation, Environment Agency, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Checkley will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Checkley so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. 	Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+ Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Owner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 99 comments - 94 objections and 5 support</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools. Intake pressure on primary school. Nearby developments in Fole and Lower Tean fall into this catchment. • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – A5222 is busy and fast road. Development would increase volume of traffic and pose a greater threat to pedestrians. Any new building should be with no direct access on A522. Speeding and child safety concerns. The path is very narrow along this stretch of road. Will cause problems with access onto what is already a busy road. A notorious accident blackspot. Frequent accidents on the A50 mean traffic is diverted through Checkley. Visibility would be poor at the frontages to these sites. • Infrastructure – other. Problems with the electricity supply Electricity supply in Checkly is unreliable and could not cope with extra loading. The area suffers frequent power cuts. Development would put pressure on community services. Sewage works cannot support more housing. • Landscape – The area is a living/working greenfield pasture. There are more suitable brownfield sites. This is a rural community. Public footpath runs across the field. Development would ruin the character of the village • Nature Conservation - development on a greenfield site would be detrimental to nature conservation. Site is home to wildlife including colonies of pipistrelle bats • Flood Risk – South side of A522 subject to flooding. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light). Noise pollution from increased traffic. Would have negative impact on adjacent properties. • Scale of development - The size of the sites would suggest/encourage further development. Site is excessive for five dwellings. • Listed Building / Conservation Area • Government Policy – These fields should remain in the special landscape area. SM Core Strategy – Checkley should remain as a small hamlet • Other – The approved development on the 5 acre brownfield site meets the requirement for housing. The proposed infill boundary should be abandoned and the existing village boundary preferred. Infill sites will accommodate the proposed five dwellings along with the development at the old Fole dairy in liaison with ESDC. This should be developed in full before new sites are proposed. Planned developments sufficient to 2031. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of development – A suitable infill area for 		<p>The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. • Amenity – 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. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				small scale development.			
CK008	7		0.30	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders Checkley Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – the main road from Uttoxeter and two JCB sites to Tean/Cheadle pass through Checkley. This road is straight through Checkley and is a frequent high speed overtaking area. Checkley is also on the diversion route used if the A50 is closed between Uttoxeter and Blythe Bridge. Access to the sites. Fear of houses overlooking each other. Area is prone to flooding, main sewer is at capacity. Local schools are already at capacity. Both of these sites are green field sites. <p>Checkley Village Awareness Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for development at the Fole Dairy site rather than CK008. This will meet housing requirement. Brownfield sites and infill should be utilised first Rural Village character should be preserved. Development will place enormous pressure on amenities Sites identified are excessive for five houses. Sites selected front a very busy road and accident blackspot Issues with existing electricity supply. Loss of two fields will impact on environment and Countryside. <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splay. Footway on frontage should be widened to 2m. Hedge on frontage will need to be cut back or setback or removed.</p> <p>SCC Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school. <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Owner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 99 comments - 94 objections and 5 support</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Schools Intake pressure on primary school. Nearby developments in Fole and Lower Tean fall into this catchment. Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Any new building should be with no direct access on A522. A5222 is 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 7 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and low ecological value is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The site's proximity to historic assets is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Council will work with the County Council to identify appropriate solutions regarding education provision. County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splay. Housing commitments between 2011-2015 will be factored in to calculate the village's residual housing requirement to 2031. Note that not all options are likely to be required to meet Checkley's requirements. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including SMDC Conservation, SCC Highways/Transportation, Environment Agency, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Checkley will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Checkley so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. Housing commitments between 2011-2015 will be factored in to calculate the village's residual housing requirement to 2031. Note that not all options are likely to be required to meet Checkley's requirements. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. 	<p>Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.</p>

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	DraftRecommendation
				<p>busy and fast road. Development would increase volume of traffic and pose a greater threat to pedestrians. Speeding and child safety concerns. The path is very narrow along this stretch of road. Will cause problems with access onto what is already a busy road. A notorious accident blackspot. Frequent accidents on the A50 mean traffic is diverted through Checkley. Visibility would be poor at the frontages to these sites. This site accesses the road over the brow of a hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – other. Problems with the electricity supply. The area suffers frequent power cuts. Development would put pressure on community services. Sewage works cannot support more housing. Landscape - The area is a living/working greenfield pasture. There are more suitable brownfield sites. This is a rural community. Public footpath runs across the field. Development would ruin the character of the village. Nature Conservation – development on a greenfield site would be detrimental to nature conservation. Site is home to wildlife including colonies of pipistrelle bats Flood Risk - Flood Risk – South side of A522 subject to flooding. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) Noise pollution from increased traffic. Would have negative impact on adjacent properties Scale of development – The size of the sites would suggest/encourage further development. Site is excessive for five dwellings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed Building/ Conservation Area Government Policy - These fields should remain in the special landscape area. SM Core Strategy – Checkley should remain as a small hamlet Other- <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – other. New development will keep the amenities ie school viable. Scale of development – A suitable infill area for small scale development. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity – 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. 	

Draft - Dilhorne

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
Sites within the Green Belt							
All sites				<p>Environment Agency – There is sufficient capacity within the Leek and Checkley treatment works to support growth. However there are known sewer capacity issues with the main sewer from Draycott to Checkley STW. Checkley sewage treatment works serves Blythe Bridge/Forsbrook.</p>			
DH004	20		1.13	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways – Sarver Lane is unsuitable to be used to access this site. Third party land would be needed to bring it up to appropriate standards. An access point on to Godley Lane would be more satisfactory.</p> <p>Dilhorne Parish Council Issues Raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site within curtailage of a grade 2 listed building. • Within Green belt • Access from highway is difficult due to narrow roads and existing access arrangements. • Tree preservation orders in vicinity. <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land availability unknown.</p> <p>Public response 19 comments – 19 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools School no longer threatened by low numbers. • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – No direct access to the highway. Access would be on a dangerous bend. Roads unable to take additional capacity. Insufficient capacity on Godley Lane. Traffic will bottleneck at High Street and Godley Lane. Narrow and winding roads to the village. Single lane access from Sarver Lane on unadopted road. Parking issues adjacent to site. Increased traffic will add to congestion at junction of Blyth Bridge High School. Road would need to be widened resulting in loss of trees and nearby bungalow. Safety concerns for children crossing road to school. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 20 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and distance from designated assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an issue with providing a suitable access to the site which may be difficult to overcome. • Any adverse impact on the Listed Building could potentially be mitigated, this issue requires further consideration. • The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Dilhorne as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site DH004 could be considered for release from the Green Belt. • Trees with TPOS can usually be incorporated in to development schemes with careful design. • Dilhorne has been classified as a 'smaller village' in the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy and this involves the village having an infill boundary within which development will be allowed if it is in line with planning policy. This designation is to support all village facilities not just the school. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Other – Gas and sewerage infrastructure insufficient for site. No local shops or amenities. Old mine workings believed to be under the site. Landscape – Special landscape area. Impact on Sarver Lane as part of the Moorlands Walk. Nature Conservation – impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Bats sighted in area. Tree preservation orders in vicinity. Flood Risk – The natural fall helps ground water drain to the brook. The ground is always wet. Listed Building / Conservation Area – Adverse effect on nearby grade 2 listed building. Government Policy – Green belt. Harm to openness of green belt Other – Application for 10 dwellings at Home Farm site, Godley Lane and 3 at Royal Oak High Street meets the estimated need so no need for additional housing. Future need should be met by small infill in the village. Dilhorne is designated as an infill village. This is not infill. Need for bungalows to accommodate ageing population. 		<p>Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where sites are affected by historic mine workings, investigative work will take place prior to the commencement of any development. In most circumstances, mining acts as a constraint rather than an absolute barrier to development. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. The Council has recently 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. 	
DH013	6		0.18	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility. Where is access proposed? Sarver Lane should be widened and surfaced at least partially. Visibility must be provided across front of the plot from Sarver Lane. 2m wide footway should be provided on frontage to connect to existing.</p> <p>Dilhorne Parish Council</p> <p>Issues Raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous applications by landowners refused on access issues. Junction is insufficient width to accommodate vehicles. Site is within green belt Excavation would create visual harm <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 10 comments: 10 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Access roads are narrow and winding. Additional traffic would be dangerous. Roads unable to cope with additional capacity. Access roads are not of sufficient width and do not provide the visibility required. Earlier applications for new farm track refused on grounds of access and poor visibility. Infrastructure – other Insufficient infrastructure – Gas, 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and distance from designated assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority does not raise any issues indicating that the site is undevelopable. The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Dilhorne as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site DH013 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. Views from individual properties are not protected in planning law. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Shops etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Dwellings will overlook existing property. Development will restrict views from existing property on Sarver Lane. Noise pollution. • Scale of development • Listed Building / Conservation Area – Development would have adverse affect on nearby grade 2 listed building (Day House Farm) • Government Policy – Green belt. • Other – Brownfield site (Moss Feeds) already identified and will meet required capacity. Dilhorne is designated as an infill village. This is not infill. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with its surroundings Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • It is not considered that development on this site would have an adverse impact on Day House Farm. 	
DH018	7		0.23	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design.</p> <p>Dilhorne Parish Council</p> <p>Issues Raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object on highway issues. • Traffic would emerge on a bend on New Road. • Site is within green belt and would visually harm rural area. • SMD/2014/0143 at Home Farm Godley Lane meets the required housing numbers. <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available</p> <p>Public response 13 comments: 12 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools Dilhorne Endowed Primary school more than doubled in size in recent years. • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Access to highway would be near a bend. Churnet Valley Road has blind areas. On road parking is already an issue. Roads in the village are narrow and windy and cannot cope with additional traffic. Visibility issues. Blind bends are safety concerns. • Infrastructure – other. No gas mains and sewerage infrastructure is at capacity. Few facilities in the village. Nearest shop is Forsbrook. • Landscape – Extensive excavation would be required. • Nature Conservation – Badgers and protected species in neighbouring woods. • Government Policy – Greenfield site • Other - Brownfield site (Moss Feeds) already identified and will meet required capacity. Capacity met by development at Royal Oak. Dilhorne is designated as an infill village. This is not infill. Can not fit 7 properties onto this site. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – School is under capacity. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 7 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's district ecological importance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority does not raise any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Dilhorne as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site DH018 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. • Dilhorne has been classified as a 'smaller village' in the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy and this involves the village having an infill boundary within which development will be allowed if it is in line with planning policy. This designation is to support all village facilities not just the school. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other – Growth is needed in the village to attract younger residents and families. 			
DH026	15		0.50	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>Dilhorne Parish Council</p> <p>Issues Raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic would emerge on a bend on New Road. Site is within green belt and would visually harm rural area. SMD/2014/0143 at Home Farm Godley Lane meets the required housing numbers. <p>SCC Highways: Not connected to highway apart from through DH018. Acceptable if this is possible and subject to access design and visibility at DH018</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 12 comments - 11 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Schools - Schools Dilhorne Endowed Primary school more than doubled in size in recent years. Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – No highway access. Access to the site is narrow and on a bend. Roads to the village are narrow and winding. Roads cannot cope with more traffic. Infrastructure – other - no gas mains and sewerage infrastructure is at capacity Landscape – Extensive excavation would be required. Nature Conservation – Badgers and protected species in neighbouring woods. Government Policy - Green belt site Other - Brownfield site (Moss Feeds) already identified and will meet required capacity. Capacity met by development at Royal Oak. Dilhorne is designated as an infill village. This is not infill. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School is under capacity Other - Growth is needed in the village to attract younger residents and families 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 15 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's district ecological importance and proximity to historic assets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority does not raise any issues which would prevent the development of this site. The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Dilhorne as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site DH026 is not considered for release from the Green Belt. Dilhorne has been classified as a 'smaller village' in the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy and this involves the village having an infill boundary within which development will be allowed if it is in line with planning policy. This designation is to support all village facilities not just the school. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. 	

Draft - Draycott

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							
Sites within the Green Belt							
				<p>Draycott in the Moors village is a ribbon development. There are no amenities to support even the 850 or so residents in the local parish area. Bus services stopped some years ago, We have no shops, medical services, schools, The location of proposed housing in our village seems ill thought out placing houses at the junction of Uttoxeter Road and Cheadle road. If Draycott is to have housing development then consideration needs to be made for services as well.</p> <p>Draycott Parish Council - There are other areas more suited to industrial/residential development than to use green field sites (Fole Dairy/Teon Mill). Concern that Draycott Parish is turning into a suburb of Stoke on Trent.</p> <p>Environment Agency – There is sufficient capacity within the Leek and Checkley treatment works to support growth. However there are known sewer capacity issues with the main sewer from Draycott to Checkley STW. Checkley sewage treatment works serves Draycott.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The District Council will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency and Severn Trent regarding this issue. No known infrastructure constraints that would prevent small-scale development. Sites which have received planning permission or have housing completions since 1st April 2011 will be included within the housing requirement. 	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
DC003	10		0.50	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - There is no existing access to the site. Access from Cheadle Road adjacent to the site will be difficult to achieve as it is a declassified road which is narrow and has only limited footways. In addition, there is an open watercourse between the site and the highway which will need to be crossed. Acceptable visibility may also be difficult to achieve due to adjacent trees and hedges. Access would be best achieved to this site via adjacent DC005 proposal site. Ideally a footway should be provided over the frontage of the site but as this will affect the open watercourse it may be difficult to insist upon.</p> <p>Leek and Moorland Historic Building Trust - The core of Draycott's historic past is the area that includes the church, and the hollow-way/avenue that leads from the church to the Old Rectory and its curtilage buildings (Listed Grade II). The Old Rectory is set on a moated site consisting of medieval ponds and earthworks (not Scheduled but of considerable archaeological and historical significance). Building on the northern part of DC003 could do serious damage to the setting of the building and impact on the surrounding earthworks. While limited development might be acceptable to the south of DC003 within what we presume to be the current development boundary we would prefer to see the northern part excluded.</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets and development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land. The site's district ecological importance is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has raised issues regarding access which would need to be overcome. The site 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). This study concludes that site DC003 could be considered for release from the Green Belt. The site is adjacent to a listed building. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Developer/Agent – site is available</p> <p>Public response – no comments received</p>			

Draft - Foxt

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary						
None						Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
Sites outside the draft infill boundary						
F008	8	0.29	<p>Ipstones Parish Council – Object to the site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the only industrial site in Foxt and supports two separate businesses. Support the retention of this site for industrial use. Consider that any new dwellings should be accommodated through infill only and not an allocated site. Consider there is a need for bungalows for older residents to release housing for younger residents but these should be infill. <p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: Not directly connected to highway. May be acceptable if access can be achieved and subject to design.</p> <p>Developer/Agent - Site is available</p> <p>Public response 7 comments - 1 objection, 1 neutral and 5 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>General comment from 1 respondent stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other opportunities within Foxt such as existing holiday lets at Rock House Farm <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport Infrastructure - Other Landscape Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) Scale of development <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape Scale of development – Small scale and would enhance area. Other – Site is central in village and brownfield site. Would also be a good idea to incorporate 	<p>The site has good accessibility to areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and is in proximity to designated assets, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are issues surrounding access to the site which is through an existing employment site. There are no known infrastructure constraints. Amenity – issues such as landscaping and screening (mature trees) 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. There is a limited need for new housing in Foxt. Consider that this could be met by infill opportunities within the infill boundary. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>existing garage into site. No objection to housing but please more information on numbers and timescale. Perfect spot for new housing.</p>			

Draft - Froghall

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							
Sites outside the draft infill boundary							
OC001 Bolton Copperworks Site, Froghall	50		5 hectares (net)	<p>This site was not considered as part of the Site Options Consultation as the site is already identified in the Churnet Valley Masterplan and Core Strategy Policy SS6c.</p> <p>Public response – several comments suggesting site for: Housing / leisure /recreation/ retail/ employment / gypsy and traveller site</p> <p>Issues raised: Redevelop the existing brownfield site for housing. This is an eyesore and would improve the local area. It would bring benefits to the local community.</p>	Site appraised in the Churnet Valley Masterplan SA.	<p>The site is identified in the Churnet Valley Masterplan as an opportunity site and identified in the Core Strategy as a major developed area in the countryside. Potentially suitable uses include housing (alongside employment, tourist-related retail/accommodation; and leisure purposes). This site will be included as a preferred option for these uses (as set out in Pol SS6C(4) Core Strategy).</p> <p>Any subsequent applications will be expected to meet the land use expectations set out in the Churnet Valley Masterplan.</p>	

Draft - Hollington

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							
Sites outside the draft infill boundary							
				<p>Checkley Parish Council -</p> <p>Traffic – already an issue in the village due to narrow roads, higher speed limits and the ever increasing JCB traffic. Hollington is used as a through route from Rocester to Tean/Cheadle, and these sites are on a particularly dangerous bend.</p> <p>The buildings in Hollington are historical and a majority are listed buildings. How would new buildings fit in with the aesthetics of the village?</p> <p>There is no public transport to Hollington or amenities for additional residents.</p> <p>HO002 – is situated on the narrowest section of the road. At present there is not sufficient width for two vehicles to pass. Consequently there is often a bottleneck when traffic has to stop to allow others to pass by.</p> <p>Access to St Johns Church is already a problem with no parking available so cars have to park on the narrow road.</p> <p>Site HO003 is situated on a dangerous bend.</p> <p>Access to both sites would cause additional hazards for all vehicles.</p>		See comments below.	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
HO002	7		0.26	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: May be acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Site is available</p> <p>Public response 6 comments - 6 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Sites located near sharp bend on very narrow road without footpaths and used as rat run. Access to St Johns Church already a problem. Amount of traffic using road network already busy. • Infrastructure – Other – No mains gas, schools, shops or bus. • Landscape • Listed Building / Conservation Area – Impact on setting of listed building (Hollington House) • Government Policy – To support building on brownfield sites first rather than green belt such as Teame Quarry. 	The proposed delivery of circa 7 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from designated assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • No known infrastructure constraints that would prevent small-scale development. • The site is located in a sensitive area close to Hollington House which is listed. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. • New development would need to follow the Council's design policies, which will be the subject of consultation as part of the Local Plan production process. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other – No demand for housing as under occupancy of nearby Tean Mill development. Adequate access to sites will require loss of stone walls and this will have an adverse impact on character of the village. 			
HO003	6	0.22	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: May be acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility. Site is on inside of bend, careful positioning of access will be required to achieve visibility.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Site is available</p> <p>Public response 6 comments – 6 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Schools Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Sites located near sharp bend on very narrow road without footpaths and used as rat run. Infrastructure – Other – No mains gas, schools, shops or bus. Landscape Listed Building / Conservation Area – Impact on setting of listed building (Hollington House) Government Policy To support building on brownfield sites first rather than green belt such as Teame Quarry. Other – No demand for housing as under occupancy of nearby Tean Mill development. Adequate access to sites will require loss of stone walls and this will have an adverse impact on character of the village. The site is very shallow and garden space will have to be alongside which is against good design policies in NPPG and SMDC local plan. 	The proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from designated assets is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment, both of which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. No known infrastructure constraints that would prevent small-scale development. The site is located in a sensitive area close to a number of listed buildings. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. The site relates well to the existing settlement. 	

Draft - Hulme

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
Sites within the Green Belt							
				Environment Agency – Surface water in these areas should be treated using suitable SUDS where possible. If development is in a combined sewer area, increased flow should not affect the spill frequency.			
HU002	5		0.29	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility.</p> <p>Developer/Agent Rob Duncan – Planning Consultancy - support</p> <p>Public response 2 comments - 2 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Easy access to highway network. • Infrastructure – other – Lack of facilities in village but Weston Coyney and Meir nearby. • Landscape – Greenbelt not affected as surrounded by housing and pub. • Nature Conservation – Can deliver biodiversity enhancements (tree planting) • Flood Risk – Not in flood plain. • Scale of development – spread development out with individual drives rather than 1 access point. This is more in keeping with village. • Other – Much needed housing for local people. Site is available to be brought forward within 5 years and is viable. Suitable for open market local housing needs. Owner indicated adjacent site also available for development 	The proposed delivery of circa 5 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space, areas of existing employment and location away from historic assets is likely to have a positive effect, as could the development of brownfield land. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • The site 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). This study concludes that site HU002 could be considered for release from the Green Belt. • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The majority of the site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. 	Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.

Draft - Kingsley Holt

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
KH018	8		0.26	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable if adequate visibility can be provided. Hedge, foliage and undergrowth will need to be removed which would also provide a benefit for the adjacent houses and farm access.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Landowner intentions unknown.</p> <p>Public response 3 comments - 2 objections and 1 general comment</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>General comment: Previous application on this site refused.</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport - Access to and from the A521 is blind to the north and poor to the south, with the existing 40 mile an hour speed limit any additional traffic at this point would be dangerous. • Infrastructure – Other – No schools, doctors or shops. • Other – 7 houses already granted permission but not started do these not count? Where is the demand? 	The proposed delivery of circa 8 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and areas of existing employment is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated assets. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • The planning history for this site dates back to the late 1970's and is not relevant in this case. There is no recent history on the site. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas, footpaths. • All planning consents for housing in the village from 2011 will be taken into account in calculating the housing requirement figure for the village. • 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. 	Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
Sites outside the infill boundary							
KH009	9		0.40	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility splay. Footway on frontage should be widened to minimum 2m which would assist with visibility splay.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land not available.</p> <p>Public response 3 comments - 3 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 9 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and areas of existing employment is likely to have a positive effect, as could its location away from historic assets and the development of brownfield land. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • 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 in this catchment area at Primary and High School level. 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. • New development is the main way to deliver new 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport - Access point to site poor at brow of hill with tight bends. Increased traffic. Site sits above 2 sets of terraced houses, which require 'on road parking'. These terraces lie between site KH018 and KH009 means extra cars manoeuvring on and off Churnet Valley Road, within an approximate 100 metre area. • Infrastructure – Other – No schools, doctors or shops • Landscape – Only window to surrounding landscape with views across to Ipstones. Valuable backdrop for events and functions at Chapel. • Other – Site should remain outside of village infill boundary. Staffordshire way passes site. If developed for housing will become a corridor from one side of village to another with no reason to stop in village. 7 houses already granted permission but not started do these not count? This is Open Space' laid down in the Village Plan it is outside the 'Village Boundary' 		<p>or improved infrastructure. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas, footpaths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All planning consents for housing in the village from 2011 will be taken into account in calculating the housing requirement figure for the village. 	
ADD07	50		2.2	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways – Awaiting comments.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available. Has good access, road frontage, adjoins village boundary, utilities on site or very close.</p> <p>Public response None – site was put forward during consultation.</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 52 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. The site's accessibility to areas of existing employment is considered to have a positive effect. However, the site's inaccessibility to services and facilities is likely to have a significant negative effect. Similarly, the site's proximity to designated and historic assets is likely to have a negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC, land.	Further investigations are required to establish any constraints on the site.	

Draft - Leekbrook

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
LB006	6		0.22	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Not connected to highway. How will access be achieved?</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 0 comments.</p>	<p>The site's accessibility to areas of existing employment is likely to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space and its location away from designated and historic assets. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways question how site will be connected to highway. [It is believed Spicerstone access track in joint private ownership]. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. 	<p>Allocation of housing sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.</p>
Sites outside the infill boundary							
LB011	6		0.21	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Environment Agency – Site is likely to be affected to some degree by flood risk and if taken forward will require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>SCC Highways - acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 0 comments.</p>	<p>The site's accessibility to areas of existing employment is likely to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space and its location away from designated and historic assets. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. 	
LB012	6		0.26	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Site is likely to be affected to some degree by flood risk and if taken forward will require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 0 comments.</p>	<p>The site's accessibility to areas of existing employment is likely to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space and its location away from designated and historic assets. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and provision of adequate visibility. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. 	
Employment Sites							
ADD09 (CD095 (part of))	Up to 1.67ha employment land.		1.67ha	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways – Awaiting comments.</p>	<p>The development of new employment premises should have a significant positive effect on the vitality and viability of the District,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further investigations are required to establish any constraints on the site. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			Developer/Agent/Landowner – Correspondence from owner indicates the site is available.	strengthen economic growth and support a higher level of employment within the District. The site's accessibility to open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is relatively inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is assessed as being a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to historic assets	Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement.	

Draft - Longsdon

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
				<p>Longsdson Parish Council</p> <p>How has the figure of 20 houses been arrived at as this is a small village with lack of facilities. Criteria is 1 in every 23 electors which is excessive compared with others. If the average formula is used the only 9 are required and can be met from infill and proposed homes already approved.</p> <p>The 3 sites together present a large concentration of houses out of character with area.</p> <p>Village has no mains sewerage so new houses would have to use septic tanks.</p> <p>Site LO02 already has a refusal for 1 house due to harm to SLA so how can 10 be acceptable.</p> <p>Danger of traffic emerging onto Sutherland Road/ A53. History of accidents – blind bend and 40mph traffic.</p> <p>Infill sites could manage to accommodate reduced number of dwellings.</p> <p>Why not widen village boundary to include more suitable sites such as, School Lane, Micklea Lane, Denford Road, and School Lane would be suitable sites for controlled infill development. .</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - Extending the development boundary to include LO002, LO007, and LO021 would be acceptable provided the scale and position the existing houses is respected at the road frontages.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development requirements for the different villages stem from the rural housing requirement set out within Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy, then split based on a combination of factors including existing village population/ assessed development capacities/ access to facilities and services etc. As this is an options consultation, not all site options are required to achieve the village housing requirement. Infill boundaries within the greenbelt will generally be drawn quite tightly around those settlements affected. The Council will also refer to the results of its Green Belt Review. 	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
LO002	10		0.43	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise that Woodcroft First School currently oversubscribed. Projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE First school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be required. Advise that St Edwards CofE Academy Middle School currently has some capacity. However projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE Middle school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated and historic assets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 First-, Middle-, and High Schools will be required within Leek. Educational contributions will be required. The District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to appropriately designed access point or points with adequate visibility, and maximum gradient. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. 	Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise that Westwood College currently has some capacity. However High Schools in the Leek catchment are projected to have insufficient capacity to accommodate any children generated from housing allocated across the catchment. There is limited potential to enlarge existing secondary schools in the Town. If it is not possible to enlarge existing schools to the level required for the proposed growth on existing sites, then additional land may be needed. Educational contributions will be required. Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts. In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school. <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to appropriately designed access point or points with adequate visibility which appears achievable. Footway must be widened on the frontage to 2m wide. Land falls sharply away from Sutherland Road. Maximum gradient of any access should be 1 in 10. Maximum gradient of any potentially adoptable highway is 1 in 15. Acceptability will depend on layout.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - There are good quality 19th century buildings opposite and adjacent to the LO002 and houses built on this road frontage would need to respect their scale and siting.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner has confirmed support.</p> <p>Public response 50 comments - 48 objections and 2 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Schools – Local School closed Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exacerbate problem of access and egress from Sutherland Road to A53 (blind bend no visibility). The density of traffic using the village has increased due to the Cheddleton housing developments. More houses would increase the danger of accessing the road network. Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mains drains would need to be installed to site. This site and stream in LO021 is used for run off from local septic tanks where would outfall be ? Lack of facilities – no schools or shop, post office and minimal public transport. Landscape – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is in green belt/area of natural beauty and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Longsdon to accommodate new development, an infill boundary will need to be created. 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 LO002 for release from the Green Belt. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Longsdon will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Longsdon so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with the rest of the village. Any new development 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>previous planning applications refused on this ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only area of green belt between urban areas of SM and Stoke. - Longsdon is set in SLA which should be preserved. <p>•Nature Conservation – Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>•Flood Risk</p> <p>•Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional noise of 28 houses spoil tranquillity of village. - Land slopes and will be overlooked by existing houses in Sutherland Road. <p>•Scale of development –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of dwellings proposed is excessive and not in keeping with village/rural location and spoil character of village (infill better option). - Unlikely to meet Victorian character. - New development on the The New Inn Public House site to be bungalows only, suitable for older people. - Scale of proposed development would open up sites for more housing on green belt and would connect Longsdon to potteries and loose village status. <p>•Government Policy – Against green belt policy.</p> <p>•Other –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing numbers for Longsdon excessive and more than double the average. - Infill development of say 10/15 houses max would seem to be a better option - There has been planning permission granted since 2012 for five dwellings on the New Inns Site as yet not developed. - Query viability of site given drain infrastructure required, serious waterlogging and Japanese knotweed. - Devalue existing properties. - Loss of views. - Better area for development would be around New Inn PH. - Extend village infill boundary to include all roads in Longsdon both sides of A53. - Impact on tourism as tourists visit charm of small villages around area. <p>Support</p> <p>•Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues would be negligible we all have a bad junction somewhere on the way to work. - Site is accessible from Sutherland Road as access from A53 would be dangerous. - Site adjacent to community centre and might be an option to provide consolidated access. <p>•Infrastructure – other –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drainage is not an issue with state of the art sewage treatment plants. - Located in centre of village within walking distance of remaining facilities. <p>•Landscape - There would be minimal visual impact providing design parameters are applied.</p> <p>•Nature Conservation</p>		<p>taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development requirements for the different villages stem from the rural housing requirement set out within Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy, then split based on a combination of factors including existing village population/ assessed development capacities/ access to facilities and services etc. Longsdon is a 'smaller village'. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>•Scale of development –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site has strong frontage and is capable of accommodating 2 dwellings similar to surrounding development and would therefore meet infill policy in greenbelt. - Some of the site included within village boundary and Council feel that the site could accommodate 5 dwellings. The site could also provide access to LO021. - LO02 most suitable and relates best to existing layout and character of the village. - Site could accommodate 10 homes without impacting on views and openness of village. - It is a natural infill development site. <p>•Other –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many years of no housing resulting in declining population and cannot sustain services and facilities impacting on village character. - Additional housing is required to meet long term viability of village. - Requirement of 20 is appropriate. 			
LO007 (part in draft infill boundary, part in Green Belt)	5		0.38	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise that Woodcroft First School currently oversubscribed. Projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE First school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be required. • Advise that St Edwards CofE Academy Middle School currently has some capacity. However projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE Middle school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be required. • Advise that Westwood College currently has some capacity. However High Schools in the Leek catchment are projected to have insufficient capacity to accommodate any children generated from housing allocated across the catchment. There is limited potential to enlarge existing secondary schools in the Town. If it is not possible to enlarge existing schools to the level required for the proposed growth on existing sites, then additional land may be needed. Educational contributions will be required. • Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts. • In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to 	The proposed delivery of circa 5 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated and historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 First-, Middle-, and High Schools will be required within Leek. Educational contributions will be required. The District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. • County Highways advise that site appears unable to achieve adequate visibility onto A53. However may be acceptable if accessed through LO002 or if frontage can be extended. • The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Longsdon to accommodate new development, an infill boundary will need to be created. 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 LO007 for release from the Green Belt. • Given the housing requirements of the village, it is not possible to meet this need upon brownfield sites in the village alone. Therefore a 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school.</p> <p>SCC Highways - appears unlikely to be able to achieve adequate visibility [onto A53]. May be acceptable if accessed through LO002 or if frontage can be extended.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - The road frontage of LO007 is lined by substantial houses set well back from the road and the building line of these would need to be respected.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Correspondence from owner received indicating immediate availability for housing. Also co-own LO021.</p> <p>Public response 46 comments - 44 objections and 2 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Local Schools closed. • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exacerbate problem of access and egress from Sutherland Road to A53 (blind bend no visibility). - Land would be required from adjoining sites to deliver safe visibility splays. - More houses would increase the danger of accessing the road network. • Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mains drains would need to be installed to site. - Lack of facilities – no schools or shop, post office and minimal public transport. • Landscape – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is in green belt/area of natural beauty and previous planning applications refused on this ground. - Only area of green belt between urban areas of SM and Stoke. - Longsdon is set in SLA which should be preserved. • Nature Conservation - Impact on wildlife. • Flood Risk • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional noise of 28 houses spoil tranquillity of village. - Land slopes and will be overlooked by existing houses in Sutherland Road. • Scale of development – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of dwellings proposed is excessive and not in keeping with village/rural location and spoil character of village. (infill better option). - Unlikely to meet Victorian character. - New development on the The New Inn Public House site to be bungalows only, suitable for the older people. - Scale of proposed development would open up sites for more housing on green belt and would connect 		<p>number of greenfield options have been proposed. National/Local Policy does not rule out allocating upon greenfield sites. Note that not all options will be required to meet Endon's requirements. Note that not all options will be required to meet Endon's requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Longsdon will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Longsdon so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. • Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. • Amenity – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. • 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The development requirements for the different villages stem from the rural housing requirement 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Longsdon to potteries and loose village status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Government Policy - Against green belt policy. •Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing numbers for Longsdon excessive. - Infill development of say 10/15 houses max would seem to be a better option. - Query viability of site given drain infrastructure required. - Devalue existing properties. - Loss of views - There has been planning permission granted since 2012 for five dwellings on the New Inns Site as yet not developed. - Develop areas of brownfield land in Leek first. - Better area for development would be around New Inn PH. - Extend village infill boundary to include all roads in Longsdon both sides of A53. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues would be negligible we all have a bad junction somewhere on the way to work. •Infrastructure – other - Drainage is not an issue with state of the art sewage treatment plants. •Landscape - There would be minimal visual impact providing design parameters are applied. •Nature Conservation 		set out within Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy, then split based on a combination of factors including existing village population/ assessed development capacities/ access to facilities and services etc. Longsdon is a 'smaller village'.	
Sites within the Green Belt							
LO021 (small area in draft infill boundary, but most in Green Belt)	13		0.56	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise that Woodcroft First School currently oversubscribed. Projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE First school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be required. • Advise that St Edwards CofE Academy Middle School currently has some capacity. However projections across the Leek catchment indicate that the scale of new housing across it will mean that at least an additional 1 FE Middle school will need to be provided in Leek, and there is limited potential to expand existing first schools for this purpose. Educational contributions will be required. • Advise that Westwood College currently has some capacity. However High Schools in the Leek catchment are projected to have insufficient capacity to accommodate any children generated from housing allocated across the catchment. There is limited potential to enlarge existing secondary schools in the Town. If it is not possible to enlarge existing schools to the level required for 	The proposed delivery of circa 13 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is likely to have a negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated and historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 First-, Middle-, and High Schools will be required within Leek. Educational contributions will be required. The District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. • County Highways advise that development of site would be acceptable if accessed through site LO002. • The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Longsdon to accommodate new development, an infill boundary will need to be created. 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 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>the proposed growth on existing sites, then additional land may be needed. Educational contributions will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts. • In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school. <p>SCC Highways - would be acceptable if accessed through LO002.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Correspondence from owner received indicating immediate availability for housing. Also co-own LO007.</p> <p>Public response 45 comments - 43 objections and 2 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Local schools closed. Primary school is full. • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exacerbate problem of access and egress from Sutherland Road to A53 (blind bend no visibility) - More houses would increase the danger of accessing the road network. - Site is locked and would require access across other land. • Infrastructure – other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mains drains would need to be installed to site. - Lack of facilities – no schools or shop, post office and minimal public transport. • Landscape – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is in green belt /area of natural beauty and previous planning applications refused on this ground. - Only area of green belt between urban areas of SM and Stoke. - Longsdon is set in SLA which should be preserved. • Nature Conservation – Impact on wildlife. • Flood Risk • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional noise of 28 houses spoil tranquillity of village. - Land slopes and will be overlooked by existing houses in Sutherland Road. • Scale of development – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of dwellings proposed is excessive and not in keeping with village/rural location and spoil character of village. (infill better option). - Unlikely to meet Victorian character. - New development on the The New Inn Public House site to be bungalows only, suitable for the older people. 		<p>government planning guidance). This study recommends considering site LO021 for release from the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the housing requirements of the village, it is not possible to meet this need upon brownfield sites in the village alone. Therefore a number of greenfield options have been proposed. National/Local Policy does not rule out allocating upon greenfield sites. Note that not all options will be required to meet Endon's requirements. Note that not all options will be required to meet Endon's requirements. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Longsdon will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Longsdon so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. • Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. • Amenities – issues such as overlooking and loss of light 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. • It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale of proposed development would open up sites for more housing on green belt and would connect Longsdon to potteries and loose village status. •Government Policy - Against green belt policy. •Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing numbers for Longsdon excessive. - Infill development would seem to be a better option. - Devalue property. - Loss of views - Better area for development would be around New Inn PH. - Site no feasible without others. - Density of the housing does not allow for any green space. - Extend village infill boundary to include all roads in Longsdon both sides of A53. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues would be negligible we all have a bad junction somewhere on the way to work. - Site is landlocked but in the same ownership as LO007 so can be accessed from A53. •Infrastructure – Other - Drainage is not an issue with state of the art sewage treatment plants. •Landscape - There would be minimal visual impact providing design parameters are applied. •Nature Conservation 		<p>the rest of the village. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development requirements for the different villages stem from the rural housing requirement set out within Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy, then split based on a combination of factors including existing village population/ assessed development capacities/ access to facilities and services etc. Longsdon is a 'smaller village'. 	

Draft - Lower Tean

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
None				<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Checkley Parish Council</p> <p>Increase in traffic not just from this area but if the surrounding areas are developed then this will raise the traffic levels. Lower Tean is also on the diversion route if the A50 is closed between Uttoxeter and Blythe Bridge.</p> <p>Surface water run off leads to increased flooding at Mill Lane, which already has an issue with flooding.</p> <p>Detrimental effect on heritage sites, views of the burial mound and the character of the village.</p> <p>Access to both sites are particularly hazardous.</p> <p>Loss of village identity as it will become sprawling and join up with Upper Tean.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Lack of public transport, amenities, and the substation would need upgrading. Local schools are already at capacity.</p> <p>Why green field sites? There are brown field sites ripe for development.</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <p>Fole Dairy isn't included on the maps as a potential site and it is brown field, and ideal for development.</p> <p>Environment Agency – There is sufficient capacity within the Leek and Checkley treatment works to support growth. However there are known sewer capacity issues with the main sewer from Draycott to Checkley STW. Checkley sewage treatment works serves Lower Tean.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. Fole Dairy has the benefit of planning permission and will be counted towards the overall housing requirement. See comments regarding sites below 	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
Sites outside the infill boundary							
LT001	20	1		<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and if adequate visibility splays can be provided. Visibility splay be unlikely to be achieved onto Uttoxeter Road. Alternatively, access would be much more preferable off Heath House Lane. Footway should be provided to link between existing and the proposed access point. Crossroads should not be formed with Goldhurst Drive.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation - Site adjoins Willowgate, Grade II Listed cottage. Development could harm the rural setting of this building and form of the historic settlement.</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 20 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and proximity to historic assets. The site's proximity to designated assets and the inaccessibility of areas of existing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has raised an issue regarding access to the site from Uttoxeter Road. If access can be resolved to an acceptable standard then development could take place The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - Lower Tean consists of three elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the historic village with a cluster of Listed Buildings including a striking collection of farm buildings centred on a tall Dovecote (Listed Grade II) A southern development: sizeable houses in generous grounds that sit well with Bank House (Listed Grade II) A northern development: smaller, more densely packed and largely semi-detached houses <p>The positioning of the 20th century developments both respected the historic core and allowed an appropriate style of housing to develop adjacent to Bank House (Listed Grade II). In contrast: the present proposals would have an immediate and damaging impact on the early settlement and its Listed Buildings and the archaeology of a field containing a major barrow (Scheduled Ancient Monument). We suggest searching for alternative development sites. LT001 adjoins Willowgate, Grade II Listed cottage. Development could harm the rural setting of this building and form of the historic settlement. Inappropriate.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Land is available</p> <p>Public response 176 comments - 175 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Infrastructure – Schools – Schools full and Checkley School would need to expand limited options to do this. •Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic on narrow roads (Heath House Lane), poor access to site and poor visibility. - Poor public transport that does not operate at commuter times. - Parking already a premium on estate. - Heath House Lane and Teanhurst Road used as short cuts – danger to children and public footpath at junction. - A522 regularly used when A50 is closed. - Estate already used as short cut will be worse with increased traffic. - Plans to alter access into Willowgate refused due to safety concerns. •Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No employment for additional 25 homes therefore more commuting adding to traffic and pollution. - No facilities for children to play safely. 	employment are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located in the close to the historic core of the village and there are listed buildings adjacent to the site. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. 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. The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being 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. Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. The survey identifies the hedgerow as becoming more diverse further north and potentially qualify as SBI status. The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. The Core Strategy clarifies the role that smaller villages play. They have a more limited role as service centres and will provide a limited amount of housing to provide local housing opportunities. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shop is 1 mile away with little parking and disruptive at loading times. - Schools and GP's full. - Sewerage facilities poor in Upper Tean and will need to be improved. - Infrastructure in area already massively over capacity. - Housing should be nearer employment opportunities such as Cheadle, Uttoxeter and Stoke on Trent. <p>•Landscape –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is greenfield site and good agricultural land. - Development would spoil the contours of the land, ancient field layout and visually changes open aspect of land fronting Uttoxeter Road. <p>•Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife habitat (owls, badgers, bats and buzzards) and hedges/hedgerows.</p> <p>•Flood Risk –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased risk of flooding for houses near river and water run-off from new development. - Flooding on Mill Lane and road opposite Dog and Partridge is an issue. <p>•Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of privacy and light and overlooking into rear gardens due to topography.</p> <p>•Scale of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development will block views of burial ground which is scheduled monument. - Modern development impact on historic village. - This is overdevelopment of the village and does not respect pattern of development in village. <p>•Listed Building / Conservation Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is adjacent to scheduled monument and will ruin views and historical significance of the area. - Site is also near village hall and Heybridge Farm (both listed). - Views impacting on setting of listed building – Willowgate. and Heybridge Farm – which paints historical picture of Lower Tean. <p>•Government Policy – Brownfield sites should be used in preference to greenfield sites such as site at Fole Dairy.</p> <p>•Other –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already low cost homes for sale in area. - What proportion of new housing would be affordable? - Development previously refused on site due to access issues and urban sprawl. No change since then except A50 is now A522 but still busy road. - Loss of village identity bringing Lower Tean closer to Upper Tean (ribbon development). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 3 which means that it is good to moderate. • Fole Dairy has the benefit of planning permission and will be counted towards the overall housing requirement. • There is a requirement for the developer to provide a proportion of affordable housing on each site. • The Objectively Assessed Housing Need takes into account houses that are for sale. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Village needs to retain its historic character. - No shortage of housing in area and these are generally low cost. - Houses still for sale in mill devt in Upper Tean. - At public meeting in Nov 2011 land to north/west of Heath House public wanted land protected. - Will greatly increase the size of Lower Tean. - Better brownfield site at Fole Dairy. <p>Support</p> <p>Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – A522 less busy now that A50 completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Scale of development – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better related than other sites put forward through the SHLAA. - It is of an appropriate size to meet the housing need identified. •Government Policy – Planning policy has changed both nationally and locally since previous determinations. •Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be delivered in a short timescale. - Total increase in population would be 66 people less than 10% of existing population. This is not a disproportionate increase. - Greenfield sites need to be developed in addition to brown field sites such as Fole Dairy. - The existence of vacant housing is not an alternative to new development. 			
LT002	6		0.30	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - May be acceptable if visibility splays can be achieved, which may be difficult. Minimum 2m footway should be provided on frontage if visibility can achieved.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation - Group of Listed Buildings across road to the south. Development could harm the rural character and historic form of the village.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - Lower Tean consists of three elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the historic village with a cluster of Listed Buildings including a striking collection of farm buildings centred on a tall Dovecote (Listed Grade II) • A southern development: sizeable houses in generous grounds that sit well with Bank House (Listed Grade II) • A northern development: smaller, more densely packed and largely semi-detached houses <p>The positioning of the 20th century developments both</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the development of greenfield, grade 3 ALC land and proximity to historic assets. The site's proximity to designated assets and the inaccessibility of existing employment are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has raised an issue regarding access to the site. If access can be resolved to an acceptable standard then development could take place • The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. • The site is located in the close to the historic core of the village and there are listed buildings adjacent to the site. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. • 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. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>respected the historic core and allowed an appropriate style of housing to develop adjacent to Bank House (Listed Grade II). In contrast: the present proposals would have an immediate and damaging impact on the early settlement and its Listed Buildings and the archaeology of a field containing a major barrow (Scheduled Ancient Monument). We suggest searching for alternative development sites. LT002 has a group of Listed Buildings across road to the south. Development could harm the rural character and historic form of the village. Inappropriate.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – land availability unknown</p> <p>Public response 172 comments - 172 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections:</p> <p>Infrastructure – Schools – Schools full and Checkley School would need to expand limited options to do this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor public transport that does not operate at commuter times. - Heath House Lane and Teanhurst Road used as short cuts – danger to children and public footpath at junction. - A522 regularly used when A50 is closed. - Increased amount of traffic using roads, poor access to site and dangerous junctions with low visibility. - Plans to alter access into Willowgate refused due to safety concerns. - Increase in cars causing danger for children and pedestrians. - A522 used as cyclist race course extra traffic would cause danger to cyclists and other road users. - Amount of tractors and hgv's using Teanhurst and Heath House lane as rat run with some getting stuck. •Infrastructure – Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No employment for additional 25 homes therefore more commuting adding to traffic and pollution. - No facilities for children to play safely. - Shop is 1 mile away with little parking and disruptive at loading times. - Schools and GP's full. - Sewerage facilities poor in Upper Tean and will need to be improved. - Infrastructure already at capacity. •Landscape – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is greenfield site and good agricultural land. - Development would spoil the contours of the land, ancient field layout. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being 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. • Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • The District Council is working with the County Council on the issue of school capacity. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • The Core Strategy clarifies the role that smaller villages play. They have a more limited role as service centres and will provide a limited amount of housing to provide local housing opportunities. • The land has an agricultural classification of Grade 3 which means that it is good to moderate. • Fole Dairy has the benefit of planning permission and will be counted towards the overall housing requirement. • There is a requirement for the developer to provide a proportion of affordable housing on each site. • The Objectively Assessed Housing Need takes into account houses that are for sale. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of open aspect of site fronting Uttoxeter Road. - Natural underground water courses through fissures in this field. Could cause underground water pressure if blocked by development. - Several active domestic wells adjacent to older properties. - Site is SLA and recent planning applications for small development have been refused on these grounds. - Development would impact on setting, heritage and landscape. <p>•Nature Conservation – Loss of wildlife habitat (owls, badgers, bats and buzzards) and hedges/ hedgerows.</p> <p>•Flood Risk –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased risk of flooding especially near river despite flood defences being improved. - Increased flooding on Uttoxeter Road and Mill Lane. <p>•Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of privacy and light and overlooking into rear gardens due to topography.</p> <p>•Scale of development –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is overdevelopment of the village and does not respect pattern of development in village. - Will block views of ancient burial ground. <p>•Listed Building / Conservation Area –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would cause significant damage to protected monument. - There are a number of architecturally significant buildings near the plot. Development would spoil the attractiveness of these and village. <p>•Government Policy – Brownfield sites should be used in preference to greenfield sites better site at Fole Dairy.</p> <p>•Other –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already low cost homes for sale in area. - What proportion of housing would be affordable? - Site is outside village boundary and would result in loss of village identity by bringing Lower Tean closer to Upper Tean (ribbon development). - No shortage of housing in area and these are generally low cost. - Houses still for sale in mill devt in Upper Tean. - At public meeting in Nov 2011 land to north/west of Heath House public wanted land protected. - Will greatly increase the size of Lower Tean. - Development previously refused on site due to access issues and urban sprawl. - This part of Lower Tean retains its historic character modern development will spoil this. - Better brownfield site at Fole Dairy. 			

Draft - Oakamoor

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary						
			<p>Environment Agency – Draft infill boundary in Oakamoor which include additional land in floor plain and likely to be affected to some degree by flood risk and if taken forward will require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Where the main sewer is not available, packaged treatment plants and other non-main solutions are able to operate effectively and discharge their treated effluent safely into the water environment. Issues have been raised regarding this area, and the impact of the allocations needs to be considered.</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise that Valley Primary School currently has capacity. However only 4 miles from St Werburgh's Primary School in Kingsley, which is currently oversubscribed. Large scale development across the Cheadle Rural north catchment as a whole would not be able to be accommodated at the existing schools. Educational contributions will be required from additional school places. Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts. In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, e.g. walking to school. 		Comments noted.	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
			<p>Oakamoor Parish Council responses:</p> <p>OA016 – Unsuitable for housing due to: Topography Numerous underground springs Imminent Conservation Village status</p> <p>OA026 – unsuitable for housing due to: Topography Imminent Conservation Village status</p> <p>OA030 – unsuitable for housing due to: Topography Access</p> <p>OA031 - Further to our earlier recommendation, a redundant plot of land (former children's play area) lies directly opposite this area. Given the major land slip difficulties experienced with the current development (13/00163/FUL) adjacent to OA031, we – again - would recommend that this area is swapped for the land lying opposite.</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing commitments between 2011-2015 will be factored in to calculate the village's residual housing requirement to 2031. This will inform the Council when it decides whether allocations need to be proposed in this village. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>General: Oakamoor has currently two houses under development and planning has been recently approved for a further seven. Given the housing allocation is ten, we would expect, with the one parcel of land outlined above, and the two approved developments, that this would more than fulfil the estimated requirement.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation Officer - Potential for Conservation Area designation.</p> <p>Boundary around the Holy Trinity Church should be removed – Infilling would be harmful to historic character and views.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust – Oakamoor has been put forward in the Churnet Valley Master-plan as a potential Conservation Area. It would be premature to determine development boundaries until the Conservation Area boundaries have been established, as further building here on any of the proposed sites could have a damaging impact on the historic settlement. In determining the development boundary we suggest the church and its churchyard are omitted.</p>			
OA026 (mostly outside boundary but access point within boundary)	11		0.52	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders Woodland Trust – Object as site adjacent to ancient woodland</p> <p>SCC Highways - Not directly connected to the highway. Only access appears to be along a narrow, private unadopted unsurfaced track. Land will be required to provide an access of adequate width. Visibility is also restricted at the access onto Star Bank - land also likely to be required for visibility. Is any other access route possible?</p> <p>SMDC Conservation Officer - Work needed to establish any detrimental impact on settlement character and form.</p> <p>During the course of assessing the proposed Conservation Area..[this site has].. been identified as highly sensitive and unsuitable for housing allocations.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - An exceptionally steep site flanking the track leading to Staffordshire Wildlife Trust's site of Cotton Dell. This currently provides a natural boundary the eastern side of the historic settlement and should be left undeveloped.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – correspondence from owner/agent received, re-affirming support for residential allocation.</p> <p>Public response 4 comments - 4 objections</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 11 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Education advise that whilst there are no capacity issues at Oakamoor Valley primary School, there are however capacity issues across the Cheadle Rural north catchment as a whole. Therefore educational contributions will be required for additional school places. County Highways advise that site does not appear connected to highway, and there are access issues. However clarification has been provided to SCC that access is proposed via Rose Bank Cresecent, not the western access to Cotton Dell. Highways comments are awaited on this basis. The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Oakamoor will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Oakamoor so that provision can be made to 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of road infrastructure. - Country roads already have to cope with traffic to Alton Towers, JCB, Hales Caravan park etc. • Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of services such as schools doctors etc. - Significant development along Farley Road causing issues re sinkholes and landslip issues. • Landscape • Nature Conservation – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site adjoins a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve. There would be large adverse impacts upon it in both nature conservation and landscape terms. - Any idea of using it as an access to the site is ridiculous. • Scale of development – Development ruin small traditional village. 		<p>accommodate new residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. • When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Conservation, SMDC Environmental Health, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. With regards land stability the Council consults with Coal Authority and County Minerals Planning Authority during Local Plan preparation. In addition prior to the commencement of any development further investigative work may be required. • 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. 	
Sites outside the infill boundary							
OA016	9		0.40	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to suitable access and visibility. Footway should be provided on frontage. Carr Bank is steep and with limited pedestrian provision.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation Officer - Work needed to establish any detrimental impact on settlement character and form.</p> <p>During the course of assessing the proposed Conservation Area.[this site has].. been identified as highly sensitive and unsuitable for housing allocations.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - Outside and above the northern boundary of the historic settlement on an extremely steep site. Its development will put pressure on a narrow road already constrained by historic buildings.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Owner has confirmed support for residential allocation.</p>	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 9 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to suitable access and visibility. • The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site is not identified as being important landscape setting to the settlement. • When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Conservation, SMDC Environmental Health, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. With regards land stability the Council consults with Coal Authority and County Minerals Planning Authority during Local Plan preparation. In addition prior to the commencement of any development further 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>Public response 2 comments - 2 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Impact on already overstretched road network (quarry and Alton Towers). • Infrastructure – Other - Significant development along Farley Road causing issues re sinkholes and landslip issues • Landscape • Nature Conservation - This site adjoins a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve. There would be adverse impacts upon it. • Scale of development - Development ruin small traditional village. 		<p>investigative work may be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. 	
OA030	23	0.77	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to appropriate access design and visibility provision. Careful consideration required for pedestrian access to village - at the very least a footway on the frontage as far as the proposed access. Possible pedestrian route through OA031?</p> <p>SMDC Conservation Officer - Work needed to establish any detrimental impact on settlement character and form.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - Likely to have a detrimental impact on settlement character and form. An assessment of the sites industrial remains should be an important consideration here.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – agent of landowner has advised of their support for residential allocation.</p> <p>Public Response 4 comments - 4 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Impact on already overstretched transport infrastructure (Quarry and Alton Towers) • Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Severn Trent water have recently denied the use of land drains, to remove excess surface water in this area, as they had determined that the current system did not possess sufficient additional capacity. - Land has been destabilised due to development at Farley Road further development could have catastrophic results. - Subsidence and sink hole issues on site. • Landscape – Development impact on landscape and environment. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 23 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to appropriate access design and visibility provision, and consideration for pedestrian access to village. • The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site has been identified as being important to the landscape setting of the settlement. • When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Conservation, SMDC Environmental Health, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. With regards land stability the Council consults with Coal Authority and County Minerals Planning Authority during Local Plan preparation. In addition prior to the commencement of any development further investigative work may be required. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • Amenity – 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. • It is not considered that development of this 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature Conservation - Site connects to wildlife reserve. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) - The topography of this site would result in overlooking This loss of privacy and light would be unacceptable. Scale of development - Development ruin small traditional village. Other – Site identified by NFUM as low factor of safety with possible risk of land movement.. 		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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year.	
OA031	20		0.66	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and visibility provision. Farley Road must be widened on the frontage and a footway provided. Allowance should be made for a potential pedestrian route through the site for access to OA030.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation Officer - Work needed to establish any detrimental impact on settlement character and form.</p> <p>Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust - The creation of a bund is already underway here (SMD/2014/0834). Its visual impact on the historic settlement is considerable as would any further development.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – correspondence received from owners confirming interest in releasing site for housing.</p> <p>Public Response 4 comments - 4 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport - Would place an additional burden on the over stretched transport infrastructure (quarry and Alton towers traffic) – Narrow and dangerous roads. Infrastructure – Other – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land is unsuitable for development due to subsidence / sink hole issues. £2.5m to stabilise land at Farley Road – how ca the site be viable? It has been identified by (NFUM) and their geotechnical engineers as having an ACTIVE landslide with movement recorded as far up to the tree line due East of OA031. Approximately 90% of the land covered by OA031 has a slip plane approx 4 metres below the surface. This in itself makes this land unsuitable for construction without a huge investment in stabilisation. It is also land known to have had historic mining and marl extraction. The border of OA031 with the new development adjacent to Threeways will also have a huge number of subterranean concrete 	The proposed delivery of circa 20 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and visibility provision. Farley Road must be widened on the frontage and a footway provided The Council has a Landscape & Settlement Setting Study and this site has been identified as being important to the landscape setting of the settlement. 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Conservation, SMDC Environmental Health, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. With regards land stability the Council consults with Coal Authority and County Minerals Planning Authority during Local Plan preparation. In addition prior to the commencement of any development further investigative work may be required. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. Amenity – 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. The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>piles installed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape - Affects the landscape and sensitive environment. - • Nature Conservation - This area is one of the most beautiful parts of Staffordshire and connects to a Staffordshire Wildlife Reserve. • Flood Risk – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approx 75% of the land covered by OA031 is also affected by a natural spring that flows down the hill from where OA030 meets OA031 and runs onto Farley Road. - Severn Trent Water have denied the use of these land drains on previous applications on the basis the current system does not possess sufficient additional capacity. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) • Scale of development - Development ruin small traditional village. 		<p>site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process.</p>	

Draft - Other Areas

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing and employment

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the Green Belt							
OC003 (south of Hulme)	6		0.25	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and visibility splay provision. Additional land from the builders yard is likely to be required to provide adequate visibility splay.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Land is available</p> <p>Public response – No comments received</p>	The development of brownfield, grade 4 ALC land is considered to have a positive effect, as could the site's accessibility to areas of open space and the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site 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). This study concludes that site OC003 should not be considered for release from the Green Belt. 	
Sites outside the infill boundary							
OC055 (Blythe Park Cresswell)	Employment		8.58	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders Draycott Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan does not include the 168 houses next to the Business Park (approved Feb 2015). No objection to the principle of less than 25 dwellings in the Parish but the chosen site on Core Plan Map is not supported (poor location, access and suitability) Object to OC055 & Policy SS6c: Insufficient justification text. No assessment of impact on Cresswell settlement and toxicity. Concerns over the consultation/determination of the Blythe Park site which was approved in Feb 2015. Consider that the concerns of the community were not fully considered. Blythe Park already has areas within its boundaries for expansion <p>Developer/Agent Turley – Support – Client's site only partially features within site options consultation document and should be included in entirety. Welcome formal allocation of OC055 as employment site. Western parcel of land should be allocated for residential use. Help meet housing needs. There are no environmental constraints on site restricting development that cannot be overcome by mitigation. Creation of 1,000 full time jobs. Decision by SMDC to grant planning permission demonstrates Council are supportive of development on this site.</p> <p>Public response 11 objections, 1 support</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Schools – There are no schools within walking distance of site. Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Increase in traffic at peak times would be unsafe, especially 	The development of new employment premises should have a significant positive effect upon the vitality and viability of the District, strengthen economic growth and support a higher level of employment within the District. Similarly, the site is located away from designated and historic assets. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities, is within a flood zone which are both assessed to have a significant negative effect. The development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land is considered to have a negative effect.	SITE HAS PLANNING PERMISSION PENDING	Site has planning permission – No Decision issued March 2016

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+ Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>around Blythe Bridge. Road from Cresswell to Draycott has pinch point at the Izaak Walton. Issue of HGV's using local road network (Draycott and Cresswell, Hilderstone) No land acquired by developer for footpath. Local bus service poor so increased car users. Access to site dangerous. Surrounding road network will be congested and dangerous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Other – There are no amenities for 168 houses such as doctors and dentists and shops within 2 miles therefore residents will have to use their car to travel to Cheadle or Blythe Bridge • Landscape –Damage to wildlife and landscape. Location of site in SLA and green field site. • Scale of development - Cresswell is classified as a hamlet. Werrington and Cellarhead and Waterhouses are also hamlets and their development in the local plan is a lot smaller. 10 hectares of employment developments is needed in the WHOLE of the Staffordshire Moorlands. The local plan has put 8.58 hectares of this just in Cresswell Scale of development including houses too big for hamlet. • Nature Conservation – Impact on wildlife and hedgerows. Next to nature reserve. • Amenity – Area much noisier. Amenity The noise of HGV's travelling through the residential area and the safety aspect of these vehicles travelling around proposed roundabouts close to pedestrians and cyclists is unacceptable. A limit of 16 HGV's at night has been proposed but there is no limit during the day. Health and safety is a HUGE issue. • Flooding – Area prone to flooding. In flood risk area 1, 2 and 3. • Listed Building / Conservation Area – • Government Policy - The local plan does not correspond with the adopted Core Strategy. It corresponds with the DRAFT Core Strategy which was rejected and support for the expansion of Blythe Business Park" in the draft Core Strategy was removed. • Other - Support of expansion not justified in supporting text. The evidence indicates 70ha of employment land available in rural areas (over 56ha with planning permission) Impact on Cresswell. Known toxic industrial waste. Is expansion feasible or desirable? There is still land off the site not remediated. 			

Draft - Rudyard

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
Sites within the Green Belt							
				<p>Environment Agency – Where the main sewer is not available, packaged treatment plants and other non-main solutions are able to operate effectively and discharge their treated effluent safely into the water environment. Issues have been raised regarding this area, and the impact of the allocations needs to be considered.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation – Proposed Conservation Area. Discuss sites near reservoir access (land associated with Rudyard Hotel) would have a major impact on openness of the area and future devel associated with the reservoir.</p>		Comments noted.	
RU016	13		0.53	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders Horton PC - object on highway grounds, there is no access to site and development would create excessive traffic. Access to the Caravan site is also from Lake Road.</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise that St Michaels CE First School currently oversubscribed. However additional school places in this catchment are unlikely to be needed to mitigate the impact of this scale of development Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school <p>SCC Highways - RU016 – Not connected to highway. How is access proposed?</p> <p>Not directly connected to the public highway. The Drive is a private/unadopted road, potholed and breaking up. The Drive will need reconstructing with agreement of owners and bringing up to acceptable standard. Gradient at junction with Camrose Hall is steep, this will need to be reduced, again by agreement with owners. The Drive narrows to a field access at 'White Barn' - additional land may be required to construct an acceptable access.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation - Need to assess on site. Likely detrimental impact on form of village/ setting of canal</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 13 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from historic assets are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Education advise that whilst the local First School is currently oversubscribed, additional school places in the catchment are unlikely to be needed. County Highways raise physical/legal/ownership issues regarding access of this site from 'The Drive'. It would need to be established whether these issues are viably surmountable (or whether alternative access arrangements are available). The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Rudyard to accommodate new development, an infill boundary will need to be created. 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 RU016 for release from the Green Belt. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including SMDC Conservation, SCC Highways/Transportation, Environment Agency, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings 5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>feeder.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner has confirmed site is available for housing. Also clarifies that some adjacent land to the south (connecting to 'The Drive') is also available.</p> <p>Public response 14 comments - 14 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – - No access to site without demolition of house/garage. - Lake Road is very narrow with no parking restrictions or turning areas. - The Road also serves, Hotel, sailing club, caravan site, church, lake and visitors centre and parking causes problems and congestion. - Infrastructure – Other – Development would affect main sewer that runs across the site. - Landscape – - Site would be very visible and detract from natural beauty of area. - Site is in green belt - Nature Conservation – Damage to ecology - Flood Risk – Site next to stream and adjacent fields have flooded in past. - Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) - development would lead to noise and loss of privacy. - Scale of development – Would alter character of village. - Other – De value property <p>Footpath runs along site.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • Amenity – 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 • 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. 	
RU020	14	0.43	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders Horton PC – This is the preferred site</p> <p>SCC Education –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise that St Michaels CE First School currently oversubscribed. However additional school places in this catchment are unlikely to be needed to mitigate the impact of this scale of development • Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts • In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and visibility splays.</p> <p>SMDC Conservation - Need to assess on site. Likely to be</p>	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 14 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, the district ecological importance of the site and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Education advise that whilst the local First School is currently oversubscribed, additional school places in the catchment are unlikely to be needed. • County Highways have advised that development of site acceptable subject to access design and visibility splays. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Rudyard to accommodate new development, an infill boundary will need to be created. 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 RU020 for release 	<p>Allocation of site not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.</p>

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>acceptable.</p> <p>Developer/Agent Rob Duncan Planning Consultants - Support</p> <p>Public response 13 comments - 3 objections and 10 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport- Roads cannot accommodate additional traffic. • Infrastructure - Other • Landscape – This is a local beauty spot. • Nature Conservation • Flood Risk • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) – Loss of light and privacy plus additional noise. • Scale of development <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport - It has good access/egress to highway and public transport. Existing access same ownership as site. • Landscape – Site is brownfield site. • Flood Risk – not in flood plain. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) • Scale of development – Relate well to existing development and character of village. Well screened. • Other – More housing is needed and this site very suitable. On site of old hotel so already developed land. Permission already granted for housing but approval lapsed. Preferred option of Parish Council. Site achievable and viable within 5 years. 		<p>from the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The Council also fully consults with both the Environment Agency and County Council Lead Local Flood Risk Officer during the Plan preparation process. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed • Amenity – 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 • 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. 	

Draft - Rushton Spencer

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary							
				<p>Environment Agency – Where the main sewer is not available, packaged treatment plants and other non-main solutions are able to operate effectively and discharge their treated effluent safely into the water environment. Issues have been raised regarding this area, and the impact of the allocations needs to be considered.</p> <p>SCC Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rushton CE Primary School currently has some capacity. The small number of homes proposed in Rushton Spencer should not impact significantly on this school. Given the total number of dwellings proposed across the entire catchment area, additional school places are unlikely to be needed to mitigate the impact of this scale of development in the area. Consultation with SoT LEA will be required as there is potential for cross-boundary impacts from level of growth in this part of Moorlands. In general consideration should be given to sites' proximity to essential infrastructure and services to maximise sustainable transport, eg walking to school. <p>General objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> apparent omission of the permitted housing development site off Sugar Street, to the south of the school and request its inclusion <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site RS006 forwarded for inclusion by landowner. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffordshire County Education Authority advise that there is currently some spare capacity at Rushton CE Primary School and that the small number of homes proposed in Rushton Spencer should not impact significantly on this school. Additional school places are unlikely to be needed to mitigate the impact of this scale of development in the area. Housing commitments between 2011-2015 will be factored in to calculate the village's residual housing requirement to 2031. This will inform the Council when it decides whether allocations need to be proposed in this village. The EA have not ruled out development of any of the sites, subject to consideration of each of their impacts. 	Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
RS005	7		0.45	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>Summary of Parish Council meeting submitted by District Councillor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for five houses can be met by infill development within the existing infill boundary. None of the sites are suitable or desirable for development and should be removed from future consideration. The village does not have a mains sewerage system. Traffic issues were a cause for concern. <p>SCC highways - Slopes up from Sugar Street. Will need careful design to achieve acceptable gradients. Mature hedge and stone wall on Sugar Street frontage. Footway 2m wide should be provided on Sugar Street. Likely to</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 7 dwellings is considered to have a positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, the district ecological importance of the site and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highways Authority advise that subject to acceptable gradients and provision of 2m footway, likely to acceptable subject to access design and visibility. 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 – which will be subject to public consultation next year. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, 	Does not need to be allocated: site lies within existing infill boundary

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<p>acceptable subject to access design and visibility.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner confirms that would be willing to release the land for future development.</p> <p>Public response 11 comments – 11 objections</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools Primary School is oversubscribed. • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage on Sugar Street is already heavily congested with farm vehicles and school traffic. • Access road is narrow and existing residents park there. Location is on a badly drained junction. • Leek Old Road needs traffic calming implementation. • Public transport is poor. • Landscape – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would impact the rural character of the village • Earlier application to convert field into garden was refused on these grounds. • Field is integral part of unspoilt village setting. • Land is on a steep upwards slope. • Ivy House opposite is already approved for 11 houses adding to congestion and housing density. • Lack of public transport, shops, doctors. Post office etc. • Development would change the rural nature of the village. • Flood Risk – Surface water run-off and standing water is an issue on this site. Sugar Street is subject to flooding. • Scale of development – prominent position in the village • Other – Lack of demand for existing housing. 		<p>footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Rushton Spencer will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Rushton Spencer so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. 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. 	
Sites within the Green Belt							
RS009	30		1	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays of 2.4mx120m.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Landowner has confirmed supports residential allocation.</p> <p>Public response 10 Comments - 10 objections</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools. Local schools fully subscribed. • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access issues. • Narrow frontage onto A523, Dangerous junction at the Royal Oak pub. • Infrastructure – other. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 30 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, the district ecological importance of the site and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Highways advise that development of site acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays. • The land in question is within the Green Belt. In order for Rushton Spencer to accommodate new development, the Green Belt boundary may need adjustment. 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 that RS009 is not released from the Green Belt. • It is not considered that development of this particular site would be out of proportion with 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mains sewer. Properties rely on septic tanks. Landscape Land held under lifetime agricultural tenancy. Impact on rural street scene. Scale of development - The site is identified as being capable of delivering 30 dwellings, over 4 times the identified requirement for the village across the 20 years to 2031. Listed Building / Conservation Area Government Policy – Green belt site. Identified development needs can be met from non-green belt sites within the immediate locality. Release of RS09 would be inconsistent with the development priorities and scale of development appropriate for Smaller Villages as set out in the Core Strategy Local Plan. Other – Lack of demand for housing. Existing development land not started shows lack of demand. Housing needs can be delivered by infill. 		<p>the rest of the village. Any new development taking place will be subject to design policies contained within the new Local Plan – which will be subject to public consultation next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support an improved bus service, and provision of a mains gas supply. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. childrens' play areas, footpaths. Similarly, any existing facilities/services in Rushton Spencer will assess their capacity needs as a result of new development in Rushton Spencer so that provision can be made to accommodate new residents. Severn Trent have stated that they have a duty to complete necessary improvements to sewers to provide the capacity for new development. The Council will continue to liaise with the EA and Severn Trent regarding this issue. Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale or derelict. 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. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Environmental Health, SMDC Conservation, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. 	
Sites outside the infill boundary							
RS007	26		0.84	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC highways - Footway should be widened to 2m on frontage. Accesses will require visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – correspondence from landowner confirms site still deliverable for housing.</p> <p>Public response 9 Comments - 9 objections</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Site too narrow for access road plus new row of houses. Limited visibility to main road. Infrastructure – other 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 26 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, the district ecological importance of the site and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways advise that visibility splays and footway widening required, but otherwise development not ruled out. When deciding over which site options to proceed with the Council will consider the respective comments of statutory consultees including Environment Agency, SMDC Environmental Health, SMDC Conservation, SCC Highways/ Transportation, infrastructure providers etc; and utilises the results of its sustainability appraisal work. The Council would expect that any development proposals affecting a public right of way would avoid impacting upon its route (or require 	

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially contaminated site. Septic tank contamination. Drainage issues from those built there already. Further houses would exacerbate this. Legal mine on site. 6 homes already built on site, these did not prove to be affordable. No access to mains sewer. Landscape – 2m Public footpath on site Nature Conservation – Previously a designated SSI - what happened to remove this? Flood Risk – Damage and loss of existing land drains and soakaways has led to standing water and flood risk. Drainage and contamination issues are part of ongoing legal dispute. Brook runs through site with known flood risk. Other – Employment in the village is limited. Most housing owned by elderly residents which will be available within next few years. 		<p>appropriate re-routing as required under legislation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. Owing to its size, range of facilities/services, etc, Rushton Spencer is identified in the adopted Core Strategy as a 'smaller village' meaning that the scale of housing proposed relates to local needs only; and only limited economic development is envisaged. 	
RS015	12		0.41	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways: Visibility at Tanhouse Lane onto A523 is severely restricted. May be acceptable if access is provided directly onto A523 subject to access design and visibility</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Landowner – Owner position unknown.</p> <p>Public response 10 comments – 10 objections</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Schools – School full to capacity Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Tan House Lane is single track with a blind junction to the A523 Infrastructure – other. Limited facilities, shops, public transport etc. Landscape – Development would spoil the green field approach to the village. Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) - loss of local open space. Only flat green space in the village. .Site is better suited to community use. Other - Housing needs should be met by infill. Should be used for future expansion of the business rather than for housing. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 12 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, the district ecological importance of the site and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Highways advise that visibility to site is severely restricted but development may be acceptable if access is provided directly onto A523. Owing to its size, range of facilities/services, etc, Rushton Spencer is identified in the adopted Core Strategy as a 'smaller village' meaning that the scale of housing proposed relates to local needs only; and only limited economic development is envisaged. 	

Draft - Stockton Brook

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity dwellings	5+	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the draft infill boundary							
None							Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within an amended (extended) infill boundary.
Sites within the Green Belt							
SB014	10		0.35	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>Endon Parish Council – Object re greenbelt, narrow access to site and understand planning permission already granted on residential garden area.</p> <p>SCC Highways - No existing access off Willfield Lane. Declassified one-way road with no footways or street lighting. Considerable level difference. Overall appears inappropriate site for development in terms of highways safety.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response 8 comments - 7 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Schools – Local schools near or at capacity. • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Roads cannot accommodate additional traffic. Surrounding roads used a cut through from Brown Edge to A53. Moss Holl/Leek Rd junction dangerous, no pavements, no lights and high volume of traffic. Stanley Road especially congested with 1 way listed bridge with heavy and large vehicles using this. • Infrastructure - Other • Landscape – Site is in greenbelt • Nature Conservation – Impact on wildlife • Flood Risk – Existing plot absorbs rainwater. • Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) • Scale of development Number of houses excessive for plot. • Government Policy • Other <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from historic assets are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's district ecological importance and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would appear that access to this site is problematic and the Highway Authority's concerns require careful consideration. • There appears to be no recent relevant planning history on the site. • The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Stockton Brook as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site SB014 could be considered for release from the Green Belt. • Staffordshire County Council say that St Luke's Primary School (Endon) currently has insufficient capacity for the likely number of pupils generated from the overall level of development in that catchment. Endon High School is also projected to have insufficient capacity and the District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. • The Council has recently 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 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape 		<p>measures will be taken as part of the site development to address any surface water issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of houses suggested for the site is an estimate at this stage and is not fixed. The actual number will reflect site constraints. 	
SB016	15	0.66	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders:</p> <p>Endon Parish Council – Support site has good access, sustainable location and would form integral part of village.</p> <p>SCC Highways - Existing bellmouth access into the site, currently bollarded off, would appear easy to extend to provide a site road</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Availability unknown.</p> <p>Public response 40 comments - 5 objections plus petition (34) and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Schools – local schools oversubscribed. Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Visibility will be restricted by listed canal bridge and busy entrance to golf club. Traffic lights Infrastructure – Other – Uncertainty over ground conditions re levels of peat and ground gas may affect viability. Village lacks facilities such as shop or school and residents have to travel. Landscape – Site is in green belt and area of natural beauty. and will be viewed from alongside the canal. Nature Conservation – impact on wildlife Flood Risk – Site has been subject to surface water flooding. Flooding in back gardens a problem. Scale of development – Cluster of development out of character with linear form of village. Why can't housing development site at old community centre count towards housing numbers for Stockton Brook? Listed Building / Conservation Area – Mayfield is listed and surrounded by ancient woodland. Site abuts Caldon Canal Conservation Area and 4 listed buildings within 100m range. Development will cause harm to heritage assets. Access road runs through grounds of listed building which will impact on its character and appearance. Other – Given viability issues site unable to deliver affordable housing numbers. Harm of delivering 15 units does not outweigh benefits. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 15 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets, district ecological importance and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority does not raise any issues to suggest that the site is undevelopable. Staffordshire County Council say that St Luke's Primary School (Endon) currently has insufficient capacity for the likely number of pupils generated from the overall level of development in that catchment. Endon High School is also projected to have insufficient capacity and the District Council will work with the County Council to identify an appropriate solution. Ground conditions would be investigated before any development took place on the site. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure / services. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development. The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Stockton Brook as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 that site SB016 could be considered for release from the Green Belt. The site adjoins a listed building and a conservation area but it is considered that a carefully designed scheme would not have an adverse impact on either of these nor the character of the village. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. The Council has recently completed a Level 1 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>Housing development should be accommodated in larger villages. Development at Moss Hill more appropriate. 5 houses erected recently so only 10 new houses required. Lots of properties for sale.</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport - Good access • Infrastructure – other – Sustainable location. • Other – Would form integral part of village 		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing requirements in the Staffordshire Moorlands are in addition to existing properties even if these are for sale. 	
ADD08	35	1.4	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways – Access would be preferable on to Moss Hill, but its not clear that there would be adequate width. Is access to Quarry House Farm included? If access is provided direct onto A53, adequate visibility, adequate offset from the existing junction, reconstructed retaining wall would be required. Pedestrian linkages should be considered. A53 footway should be widened to 2m. Transport Statement or Assessment may be required depending on numbers.</p> <p>Developer/Agent/Owner – Land available.</p> <p>Public response None – site was put forward during consultation.</p>	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 40 dwellings is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and location away from designated assets are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities and areas of existing employment which are likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to historic assets and district ecological importance are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is within the Green Belt, though the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy categorises Stockton Brook as a 'smaller village' which will include an infill boundary (to be determined through the Local Plan process). 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 does not recommend that this site is considered for release from the Green Belt. 	

Draft - Whiston

Question 5a - Potential sites suitable for housing

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
Sites within the infill boundary						
None						Allocation of sites not considered necessary – new housing could be accommodated within the infill boundary.
Sites outside the infill boundary						
			<p>General comments:</p> <p>The prioritisation of sites is led by landowners and developers rather than community and does not take into account the character of the village.</p> <p>No evidence for housing need in Whiston. Approval for housing at Copperworks – never built. Recently built houses remain unsold.</p> <p>Limited facilities in the village and community transport minimal - reliance on private car travel.</p> <p>If SMDC take into account 13 houses approved at Copperworks and a further housing at The Green and Whiston Leys then housing requirement met and exceeded.</p>			
WH002	10	0.44	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays. Access would need to be off A52 due to topography. How would pedestrians be catered for? No existing footways on A53, no obvious route to the private road to the rear of the site, despite right of way. Public right of way Kingsley 63 runs on the northern boundary.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Site may be brownfield and previous land use may have caused contamination of the ground, or through redevelopment may cause risk to water environment. Such sites will require Preliminary Risk Assessment in support of planning application.</p> <p>If affected by historic landfill. The site may be more expensive to develop due to remediation and mitigation measures to protect water environment and human health. In extreme circumstances may not be developable.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – HLW Development Ltd - support</p> <p>Public response 5 comments - 4 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p>	The proposed delivery of circa 10 dwellings and proximity to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect, as could the site's proximity to designated and historic assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site subject to appropriate access design and provision of visibility splays. There are sites in Whiston that already have the benefit of planning permission and are under construction. At this stage it is not considered that the development of this site would be necessary to meet the estimated need in this settlement. Potential contamination issues from former copper works. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – Other – limited facilities within village. • Landscape – Greenfields should be preserved • Other – Already plot at Copperworks with permission for 13 houses therefore no need. In addition houses built recently so no further development required. Houses in village remain unsold. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other – Results of recent Envirep report identifies potential contamination on site but development opportunity would facilitate comprehensive remediation of the area. 			
WH009a	15	0.80	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility splays. Stone wall on frontage would need to be lowered.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Site is available</p> <p>Public response 11 comments - 11 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Schools • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Increased traffic through village and small country lanes especially if Moneystone Quarry development goes ahead. . Poor visibility on access to site cause substantial risks to children using playing fields. • Infrastructure – Other – Lack of village facilities no post office, shop, garage, doctors etc. • Landscape - Outside of settlement boundary and in open countryside and using greenfield land. Conflict with policies SS6, SS6b and SS6c which states infill development would be allowed. LSCA states 'part of an attractive field with open views across it' The site is an integral part of the pastoral landscape and sensitive to impacts of development – Policy DC3 seeks to protect this. Development would have harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with policy DC3 of the Core Strategy. 	<p>The proposed delivery of circa 15 dwellings and proximity to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space is likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. • 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. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature Conservation Flood Risk Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) Scale of development – Development on this site would be intrusive on the landscape and impact on the amenity enjoyed by the residents on the south side of Back Lane. Development would block views of play area. Government Policy - attaches great importance to conserving and enhancing natural environment. To designate site for housing would conflict with core planning principles of NPPF. Other – This is a public open space owned by SCC. used for horse grazing, allotment and abuts children's play area. . Its supports the use of the village hall, Has potential to provide garden allotments (fresh produce important given lack of shops), provides recreational space for all ages, safe play area for children. There is already permission for at least 5 houses in Ross Rd and Black Lane and therefore no additional need. No need for housing – Copperworks not developed and enough houses for sale in village. 10+ houses built 'Bull House Development' Proposals to develop site opposite WH0018 previously refused for housing due to poor visibility. Site bought by SCC for school but not developed due to poor traffic visibility. Development would harm the settlement of Whiston, its residents, its setting in the wider landscape and would not be outweighed by any significant benefits 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Planning Policy Framework supports housing growth which meets the Council's objectively assessed housing needs. There are sites in Whiston that already have the benefit of planning permission and are under construction. At this stage it is not considered that the development of this site would be necessary to meet the estimated need in this settlement. 	
WH015	6	0.20	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of appropriate visibility splay.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy - support</p> <p>Public response 6 comments - 5 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure - Schools Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport Infrastructure – Other – Lack of amenities. Landscape – Object to building on green belt and outside village/infill boundary. Nature Conservation Amenity (e.g. noise, privacy, loss of light) 	The site's proximity to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities is likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale of development – Number of houses excessive for size of site. Government Policy Other – 13 houses already approved at old copper works site and should be taken into account including 7 at The Green and 3 at Whiston Leys so housing numbers already exceeded. Number of applications refused as outside village boundary. Site already has 1 house approved out of the suggested 5 not in keeping with current planning policy to add more to this site. <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport – Easy access to local highway network. Flood Risk - Not in flood plain Scale of development – unlikely to have impact on character of surrounding area. Views will be seen against backdrop of Ross Road and Whiston as a whole and as a part of linear development that characterises this part of the village. Other – SHLAA identifies site suitable for 6 dwellings. Site maybe suitable for small scale affordable housing. Site is viable and achievable within 5 years. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. 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. The National Planning Policy Framework supports housing growth which meets the Council's objectively assessed housing needs. There are sites in Whiston that already have the benefit of planning permission and are under construction. At this stage it is not considered that the development of this site would be necessary to meet the estimated need in this settlement. 	
WH0016	6	0.20	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of appropriate visibility splay.</p> <p>Developer/Agent – Site is available</p> <p>Public response 4 comments - 4 objections</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure – Other – Lack of facilities within village Landscape – Development should not occur on greenfield sites. Site is outside settlement boundary and in open countryside and conflict with policies in Core Strategy – SS6, SS6b SS6c. Other – Already plot at Copperworks with permission for 13 houses Other and recently approved housing in village therefore no need. Housing in village remains unsold. 	The site's proximity to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to areas of open space and the proposed delivery of circa 6 dwellings are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. There are sites in Whiston that already have the benefit of planning permission and are under construction. The site is well related to the existing settlement and could be a reserve site if needed. 	
WH0018	5	0.17	<p>Statutory bodies/stakeholders</p> <p>SCC Highways - Acceptable subject to access design and provision of visibility. Existing footway should be extended.</p>	The site's proximity to areas of existing employment is considered to have a significant positive effect. Similarly, the site's accessibility to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway Authority has not raised any issues which would prevent the development of this site. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p>Developer/Agent – Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy - support</p> <p>Public response 8 comments - 7 objections and 1 support</p> <p>Issues raised:</p> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure - Traffic / Transport – Increased traffic through village and narrow lanes. Poor visibility on access to site cause substantial risks to children using playing fields. • Infrastructure – Other – Lack of facilities within village • Landscape – Outside of settlement boundary and in open countryside and using greenfield land. Conflict with policies SS6, SS6b and SS6c which states infill development would be allowed. LSCA states 'part of an attractive field with open views across it' The site is an integral part of the pastoral landscape and sensitive to impacts of development – Policy DC3 seeks to protect this. Development would have harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with policy DC3 of the Core Strategy. Development would fail to make effective use of greenfield land contrary to policies SD1 and SS1 of Core Strategy. Site has character and appearance of open countryside • Scale of development – Would block views of safe play area. • Government Policy – attaches great importance to conserving and enhancing natural environment. • Other – There is already permission for at least 5 houses in Ross Rd and Black Lane and therefore no additional need. Already plot at Copperworks with permission for 13 houses Other and recently approved housing in village therefore no need. 10+ houses built 'Bull House Development' Housing in village remains unsold. This site has had several planning applications refused the most recent dismissed at appeal Oct 2014. Development would harm the settlement of Whiston, its residents, its setting in the wider landscape and would not be outweighed by any significant benefits <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure -Traffic / Transport - Easy access to highway network and existing village facilities. • Flood Risk – Not in flood zone • Scale of development – Site has potential for 5 	<p>areas of open space and the proposed delivery of circa 5 dwellings are likely to have a positive effect. However, the site is inaccessible to services and facilities which is likely to have a significant negative effect. The site's proximity to designated and historic assets and the development of greenfield, grade 4 ALC land are likely to have a negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development is the main way to deliver new or improved infrastructure e.g. more residents may support more local facilities. Infrastructure needs specifically related to a new development will be provided as part of that development e.g. children's play areas. • A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the plan production process if the site is taken forward. • The Council has recently completed a Phase 1 Ecological Study for the District. This assessed sites included in the Site Options consultation. The site survey results will be used as part of the site selection process. Any other sites which come forward and are potentially suitable for development will also need to be assessed. • The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the District, the results of which are being used to inform the site selection process. The site is within Flood Zone 1 – Low probability. • 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. • The National Planning Policy Framework supports housing growth which meets the Council's objectively assessed housing needs. • There are sites in Whiston that already have the benefit of planning permission and are under construction. At this stage it is not considered that the development of this site would be necessary to meet the estimated need in this settlement. 	

Site Reference	Capacity 5+ dwellings	Size of site	Key Issues from the Site Options Consultation July 2015	Sustainability Appraisal Report	Comment	Draft Recommendation
			<p> dwellings, SHLAA suggests some limited development along frontage of Eaves Lane. In keeping with established character of village. Linear development enclosed by existing residential development. Feasible to develop split level housing to reflect slope of site. • Other – Site is economically viable and achievable within 5 years. </p>			