

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY / INFILL BOUNDARY

OPEN SPACE

TOWN CENTRE (BOUNDARY + PRIMARY & SECONDARY FRONTAGES)

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
OPEN SPACE GENERAL COMMENTS				
All Sites		Staffordshire County Council - Education	In relation to the areas of Open Space identified throughout the site options document it is noted that all school playing fields have been included, some in their entirety others appear to only include certain parts. There is no definition in the plan as to what 'Open Space' constitutes; what criteria have been applied to its selection; whether it needs to be accessible to the general public; or what policy restrictions may be imposed to such land. We therefore would wish to reserve our position on 'Open Space' at school fields and suggest that further discussion is required on whether the identification of school playing fields as 'Open Space' is required given the protection afforded to playing fields already through National Planning legislation and school premises legislation.	'Open Space' identified in the site options consultation included the open space typologies included in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment and visual open space. ACTION REQUIRED Clarify this at Preferred Options Stage.
LEEK				
Development Boundary Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 5 No (amendments not required) 35				
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Leek lies in a hollow surrounded by hills, with the core of the settlement on the highest point within that hollow. This relationship to the landscape needs preserving without overspill or impact on	It is recommended that site LE143 and LE143a are not taken forward as Preferred Options. AMEND PLAN

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			the wider landscape beyond the surrounding hills. The current development boundary achieves this. Proposals to develop LE143 and 143a do not and should not be brought into the development boundary.	
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Mount Road is a much valued walk for many people with fine views across the town and out to open countryside. Development on LE142b and the northern end of LE142a would not compromise this; neither would development on parts of LE066 where support housing for Knivedon Hall already blocks the views. Suggest alterations to the development boundary to include the relevant areas.	Comment noted. Include preferred option sites within draft town development boundary. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The setting of Haregate Hall (Listed Grade II) has been heavily compromised by recent building. It is essential to remove the Hall and its remaining curtilage to ensure the long term preservation of its setting.	Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	The development boundary on the east side of Leek should not be extended. Any further development along Mount Road will impact on the people who currently walk or run round 'The Mount' and get superb views over Leek. Brownfield sites closer to the town centre should be fully utilised before any development boundaries are expanded.	The Leek Area Strategy of the Core Strategy states the Council will address this need by allocating housing sites both within the urban area; and on peripheral sites which are 'in locations which relate well to the urban area, can be assimilated into the Landscape..', with a phasing approach prioritising the urban (preferably brownfield) sites first. The Council will also make a small allowance for small windfall sites coming forward for housing in the town when deciding how much land it needs to allocate. But it is not possible to meet Leek's remaining housing need purely from urban/brownfield sites. The Council utilises its evidence base, including landscape character studies, as part of the Plan-making process.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Moving the town boundary to include green belt areas should only be considered as a last resort when there are no existing brown field sites left to redevelop. There are currently plenty of these areas in Leek which should be redeveloped. Use brownfield sites	<p>The Leek Area Strategy of the Core Strategy states the Council will address this need by allocating housing sites both within the urban area; and on peripheral sites which are 'in locations which relate well to the urban area, can be assimilated into the Landscape..', with a phasing approach prioritising the urban (preferably brownfield) sites first. The Council will also make a small allowance for small windfall sites coming forward for housing in the town when deciding how much land it needs to allocate. But it is not possible to meet Leek's remaining housing need purely from urban/brownfield sites.</p> <p>Urban brownfield sites which already have residential consent would already have been accounted for in the figure above. Brownfield sites in other uses eg industry may either not be currently available, or be protected for those uses under other policies. The Leek Town Centre Masterplan does however set out a series of potential redevelopment sites for a variety of uses.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District the results of which will inform the Local Plan. This assesses the suitability of those areas of greenbelt abutting the town boundary for retention. The study did not recommend the release of any of this Green Belt.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	LE102 - Currently on the periphery of an area of landscape character it would need an amendment to the Town/Development Boundary to include this particular site. It is outside all proposed boundaries and so should not require any changes.	<p>It is recommended that sites LE102 & LE103 are not taken forward as a Preferred Option.</p> <p>The Council takes into account results of its landscape character and Green Belt Review evidence as part of the Plan-making process.</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			LE103 is outside all proposed boundaries and so should not require any changes.	NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	LE276 – The Cricket Club believe that this site should be confirmed for housing site allocation purposes within the Town development boundary If this is approved we understand that the Town Development Boundary would automatically be extended to include this site (as per the SHLAA consultation document).	Site currently attracts a 'C' classification in the SHLAA (separation from current town boundary; part greenfield). Also site considered too small for allocation purposes (only 'B' sites of 10+ yield were mapped as 'options'). NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 4 No other areas suggested 31				
Open Space		Public	The remainder of Highfield (with exception of site ref LE276 – the 2 horse fields at Bridge End and the area immediately adjacent to the 3 existing dwellings in the north end of Highfield) could be classified as Open Space.	This is currently within open countryside and in private ownership. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	Site LE140 is proposed for housing development, yet it is already in use as an open space, with regular dog walkers, joggers and families using this safe environment as an important leisure amenity.	Site understood to be no longer used as school playing fields. Site is not publically owned; and there are no formal public rights of way crossing the site. Consider the inclusion of pedestrian links within any potential housing scheme. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre		Leek Town Council	Russell St - Halifax Bank to former college building should have primary status on this side of the street. Stockwell St/ Church St buildings fronting Market Square should have primary status for a consistent designation of the Market Place.	It is not considered appropriate to change the west side of Russell Street from secondary to primary retail frontage. Government guidance states that "primary frontages are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses which may include food, drinks, clothing and household goods. Secondary frontages provide greater opportunities for a diversity of uses such as restaurants, cinemas and businesses." With this in mind it is considered that Russell Street should remain as secondary frontage as the types of units on this street fall into the secondary rather than primary category. This allows

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>a greater diversity of uses in this street.</p> <p>It is also considered that the top of Market Square also has a diverse range of uses and would be best categorised as secondary frontage.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre		Senior Regeneration Officer SMDC	Proposed boundaries are too big and include too much of peripheral retail – would like to see them re-drawn over a smaller area which would then allow for more flexibility on unused edge of centre retail.	<p>It is considered appropriate to make some amendments to the Town Centre boundary to remove peripheral areas which are not predominantly occupied by main town centre uses. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West side of St Edward Street; • South side of Brook Street; and • Most of Ball Haye Street. <p>AMEND PLAN</p>
<p>BIDDULPH DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 33 No (amendments not required) 13</p>				
Development Boundary		Landowner	Remove Brough Works from Green Belt to reflect planning consent.	<p>The draft new Town Development Boundary proposes incorporating the Brough Works, thereby removing it from the Green Belt as a result of the planning consent.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Continue to exclude BD068, BD062, BD083 and BD087 from the development boundary.	<p>BD083 is not recommended to be taken forward as a Preferred Option due to recent evidence in the Green Belt Review which considers this area to be unsuitable for development. The other sites are recommended for taking forward as preferred options and this is supported by evidence from the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>None of the sites are currently shown as being in the development boundary but once the sites have been finalised (after the hearing sessions have taken</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				place) the final sites will be included within the development boundary in the adopted version of the plan. AMEND PLAN
Development Boundary		Public	Gillow Heath – It would be beneficial to consider areas west of Biddulph TC bypass up to the boundary of Akesmore Lane/Tower Hill Road. These are more natural boundaries and would help to centralise the TC.	This area is being considered for inclusion in the plan. Not all of this area is needed (or suitable) to meet Biddulph's housing requirements but the Green Belt Review has identified a particular area between the Biddulph Valley Way and Akesmoor Lane which is being considered. AMEND PLAN
Development Boundary		Public	<p>A visual Inspection of the existing Town Map clearly shows a 'pocket' of green belt almost entirely surrounded by a town boundary in the Marsh Green area . At a time when sites are actively being sought this makes no sense. The town boundary should be amended to use Marsh Green Road as the boundary from the bridge by the sewage works to where it rejoins Marsh Green Road by the Staffordshire Way .</p> <p>The existing Town Map extends much further north (to Grangefields) and much further west into Gillow Heath than the proposed amendment .</p> <p>NB this 'pocket' of land WAS in the original town boundary and was only put in the Green Belt in the 1980's to prevent building rather than for aesthetic reasons .</p> <p>The Area is well located , being close to the town's facilities and main transport routes. (Many of the other areas under consideration represent encroachment into the historic Green Belt boundaries. NPPF</p>	<p>Sites in this area were considered as part of the Site Options Consultation. The Council has since undertaken a Green Belt Review to assess which areas of Green Belt could be considered for release for development and which areas are not appropriate for release. The whole of the area referred to has been assessed as part of the Study. BD083 is not recommended to be taken forward as a Preferred Option. The other sites are recommended for taking forward as preferred options and this is supported by evidence from the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>None of the sites are currently shown as being in the development boundary but once the sites have been finalised (after the hearing sessions have taken place) the final sites will be included within the development boundary in the adopted version of the plan.</p> <p>AMEND PLAN</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			sequential test should apply p14/65).	
Development Boundary		Public	BD087- retain brook as boundary to greenbelt. Include Victoria Colliery (brownfield site). Around BD117, BD069, BD131b.	BD087 is currently within the Green Belt. However, the recent Green Belt Review recommends that this area could be considered for development. Once the sites have been finalised (after the hearing sessions have taken place) the final sites will be included within the development boundary in the adopted version of the plan and at that point the Brook would act as the Green Belt Boundary. The former Victoria Colliery (now Victoria Business Park) is already included within the Biddulph Development Boundary. Sites BD117, BD069 and BD131b have all been included as options and the development boundary will expand to accommodate them if they are on the list of final sites for inclusion in the plan, as explained above. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	New town boundary seems sensible.	Comment noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Land at rear of Victoria enterprise centre. Marsh Green Road has properties on its western side from the A527 to Portland Drive and then from the west side of the Staffordshire Way until it changes to Wells Lane. The boundary should continue along Marsh Green Road , rather than being diverted off along the sewage access lane, public footpath, north along the Staffordshire to where it re joins Marsh Green Road.	Land immediately to the rear of Victoria Business Park is part of the Biddulph Valley Way and it would be difficult to find a way to cross this to access the land beyond, which is adjacent to the District boundary line. In any case, the Council's recent Green Belt Review does not support development in this area. Site BD117 is considered to be an appropriate way to expand the Business Park. The Council's Green Belt Review does suggest some change in this area would be appropriate but it does not suggest removing all of the land around the sewage works from the Green Belt. Therefore it would not be appropriate to continue the

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>development boundary along Marsh Green Road.</p> <p>Once the sites have been finalised (after the hearing sessions have taken place) the final sites will be included within the development boundary in the adopted version of the plan. In the meantime, no alterations to the development boundary in this area are recommended.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 13 No other areas suggested 26</p>				
Open Space		Public	Land to the east of Pennine Way - these areas are used for recreation by local people of all ages and wildlife is a very important issue.	<p>The Green Belt Review Study recommends that this area remains as part of the Green Belt so no open space designation is necessary.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	Gillow Heath (no further details provided).	<p>A significant area of open space already exists at Gillow Heath. It is unclear from the response whether a further area is being suggested for open space.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	North of Park Lane.	<p>The Green Belt Review Study recommends that this area remains as part of the Green Belt so no open space designation is necessary.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	BD062 - used for recreation for decades, has clear access on to National Route 55.	<p>Links through the site to the Biddulph Valley Way will be required to be retained if this site is redeveloped. The land is in private ownership and considered to be suitable for development – it is in a sustainable location and its development is supported by evidence in the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	Meadows school site.	The part of the Meadows School site which is

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>brownfield is currently the subject of a planning application for redevelopment for extra care housing. The adjacent playing field is not proposed for development as it is used by local schools and is already included as open space.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	BD068 - used for recreation for decades.	<p>The land is in private ownership and there are no public footpaths across it. The land is considered to be suitable for development – it is in a sustainable location and its development is supported by evidence in the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	The area of land off the bypass down to Akemoor Lane.	<p>This area has been suggested for housing development by a number of respondents to the Site Options Consultation and also as part of the Green Belt Review. Its potential is currently being investigated.</p> <p>As the area currently lies within the Green Belt it is not considered suitable for a Public Open Space designation.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Biddulph Town Council	The town has a good range of open spaces serving all areas and these should be protected from any future development.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre		Senior Regeneration Officer, SMDC	Proposed boundaries are too big and include too much of peripheral retail – would like to see them re-drawn over a smaller area which would then allow for more flexibility on unused edge of centre retail. Town Hall should be included in the Town Centre Boundary.	<p>It is agreed that the Town Centre Boundary would benefit from a number of minor adjustments to ensure that areas included are predominately occupied by main town centre uses. Proposed amendments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude area on Congleton Road; • Exclude small area on the east side of John Street; and

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exclude area to the south of Well Street <p>It is agreed that the Town Hall should be included within the Town Centre Boundary.</p> <p>AMEND PLAN</p>
CHEADLE DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 15 No (amendments not required) 37				
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	We are concerned about the extent of encroachment into both the Green Belt to the west and open countryside to the east. We hope every effort will be made to minimize this by keeping, as far as possible, within the current development boundaries.	Comments noted. The Core Strategy prioritises sites within the urban area before sites within the open countryside. Sites within the Green Belt will only be considered for release in exceptional circumstances. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	CH016b Green belt currently runs through middle of site - lower half already developed with housing on three sides. Site on edge of urban area within easy walking distance of town centre and amenities Infill consistent with character of surrounding area.	The Green Belt Review recommends that the Green Belt makes a significant contribution in this area of Cheadle. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	The Council should not be putting a boundary around something that does not yet exist.	The development boundary will be defined to indicate where appropriate development will be allowed. Development outside of the development boundary, i.e. within open countryside will be strictly controlled. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Remove all proposals which impact on greenfield and agricultural land.	Comments noted. The Core Strategy prioritises sites within the urban area before greenfield and agricultural land, however greenfield sites will be required to meet the housing requirement. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	On the understanding that all the sites listed under CH085 are accepted by the	Sites CH085a – CH085d are currently located within Cheadle Development Boundary.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			Council as being within the development boundary for the town - do not wish to see any change.	NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Development to the south of Cheadle would be sustainable and presumption in favour of such development is exercised by amending the Green Belt boundary to a more logical boundary along the brook and extending the development boundary to include sites CH093 and CH128.	The development boundary will be amended to include allocated sites. AMEND TOWN BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE ALLOCATED SITES
Development Boundary		Public	No new houses are required (CH075-CH077 inc). The Town boundary should not be moved just so that area's that would not have been considered previously and had been discounted by this Council should now be included.	Comments noted. The Core Strategy prioritises sites within the urban area before greenfield and agricultural land, however greenfield sites will be required to meet the housing requirement. The development boundary will be amended to include allocated sites.
Development Boundary		Public	Cheadle town boundaries are very narrowly drawn and almost all of the sites suggested by SMDC in the site options and development boundaries consultations are currently outside the town boundaries.	The development boundary will be amended to include allocated sites. AMEND BOUNDARY TO REFLECT ALLOCATED SITES
Development Boundary		Mosaic Estates	Mosaic Estates supports a revision to the town boundary of Cheadle, which is required to support the growth of the Town in meeting the requirements of Core Strategy policy SS5c but also supporting the wider District Housing and employment needs. Mosaic Estates considers that it is appropriate to redraw the boundary to include CH132 in the revised boundary for Cheadle. Given the scale of development needed in the town, further adjustments may be required in addition to expanding the boundary to the north and the council should explore this as part of future work Site Allocations DPD.	The development boundary will be amended to include allocated sites. AMEND BOUNDARY TO REFLECT ALLOCATED SITES
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 5				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
No other areas suggested 38				
Open Space		Public	The land opposite the new JCB factory on the Morewood Hall side (east) Leek Road.	This is currently within open countryside and in private ownership. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	The land north of Donkey Lane which used to be the RAF camp and the open areas of Allen Park .	This is currently within open countryside and in private ownership. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	Cheadle South – there is a lack of open space. Completely absent from plan for this area CH085d.	Open space would be required as part of an overall housing scheme. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	CH 085 a-c These areas especially are the 'lungs of Cheadle' helping to offset the pollution. It is also in these areas that the only country path is available for those walking, walking with their children and walkers theirs dogs in the whole south-west area of the town.	Open space and existing footpaths would need to be incorporated into any new housing scheme. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	I am disappointed that the town's churchyard off Church street/Hall Orchard and Park Lane is shown as open space (some being within Green Belt) How can it be open space? It's a cemetery. That should be indicated on the map. The parish church isn't shown as such also. Does the term Open Space mean it's for leisure purposes or is it protected from development	The Councils Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facility Assessment identifies the different open space typologies which includes cemeteries and graveyards which are areas for quiet contemplation. Core Strategy Policy C2 covers open space and states that it will be protected from development unless suitable alternative provision is made or an assessment demonstrates that the facility is surplus to requirements. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	Area alongside the brook (south western side of Cheadle) would remain as grassland. In part this would be to protect the habitat of the water voles and give an opportunity for informal public recreation in the long term (subject to development of wider area).	As a protected species water vole habitats must be maintained with no development creating direct or indirect impacts to impinge movement along the water corridor. This will need to be reflected in sites selected adjacent to water vole habitats. ACTION REQUIRED

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				Refer to buffer needed within sites adjacent to water vole habitats.
Town Centre		Senior Regeneration Officer - SMDC	Proposed boundaries are too big and include too much of peripheral retail – would like to see them re-drawn over a smaller area which would then allow for more flexibility on unused edge of centre retail. Properties at the top of Market Place should be included within the Town Centre Boundary.	It is agreed that the Town Centre Boundary would benefit from a minor adjustment to ensure that areas included are predominately occupied by main town centre uses. Proposed amendments are as follows: • Exclude area to the western end of High Street. It is agreed that it is appropriate to include properties at the top of Market Place within the Town Centre boundary. AMEND PLAN
ALTON DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 5				
Development Boundary		Public	There is a sizeable area of land to the east of Nabb Lane and the south of Denstone Lane that could be developed. Can this be included in development boundary?	Nabb Lane and Denstone Lane form a clear edge to the Alton village development boundary. Not considered to be an appropriate location to extend the boundary as it is not an area currently developed and is dissected from the main village by Denstone Lane which has high levels of traffic. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
BIDDULPH MOOR DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 0				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Development Boundary		Public	<p>Just wondering why the village hall isn't within the boundary as it is a fundamental part of the village and centre.</p> <p>Due to flooding/traffic issues existing boundaries should be maintained to the North of Rudyard Road.</p>	<p>The importance of the village hall within the local community is agreed. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to assess which areas of the Green Belt it would be appropriate to consider for development and which areas should not be considered. The study does not suggest removing the Village Hall from the Green Belt.</p> <p>A boundary change is proposed to the north of Rudyard Road to accommodate a proposed housing allocation. (Refer to site sheets for further details – site reference BM013).</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	BM013	<p>This site is privately owned and there is no public access so a public open space designation would be inappropriate.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>BLYTHE BRIDGE & FORSBROOK DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 11 No (amendments not required) 11</p>				
Development Boundary		Public	Only where development is to be permitted.	<p>The Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy states the Council will address housing need by allocating housing sites both within the built up area; and on peripheral sites (as required) which are 'of a small scale and..which relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape..', with a phasing approach prioritising the urban (preferably brownfield) sites first. But it is not possible to meet the village's remaining housing need purely from urban/brownfield sites.</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	The major extension of the boundary to the South East is of concern. The new area included is not contiguous with the village and is separated by two major roads. As such it could be used for employment. As an alternative we would suggest that consideration be given to adjust the boundary to include the hatched area shown on SK 113. This has a series of possible connections to the existing road network which would disperse traffic flows.(see also attached SK 114).	Note the 50ha land area to the SE of Blythe Bridge already lies outside the Green Belt as it was proposed in the 1998 Local Plan as a 'special case' sub-Regional employment investment site (Blythe Vale). This position was maintained in Policy SS8 of the adopted Core Strategy. Therefore this land area is proposed to remain rolled out of the Green Belt. The only difference is that the proposed new village boundary connects the two together by including the intervening A521/A50. Policy SS8 does not dictate where/how this site must be accessed. The Council will prepare a Development Brief for this site (encompassing access arrangements) at some point in the future. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Leave parish boundaries as they are.	The Local Plan process does not affect current Parish/Ward boundaries. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Boundary to include area for employment.	The Council has a requirement to provide approx. 33.5ha additional employment land across the District for the period 2011-2031. This is broken down into requirements for the three towns, and a 'rural requirement' under Policy SS3 Core Strategy of about 10ha. The rural requirement can be provided either as one site or multiple sites across the rural area. The 2015 options consultation mapped a number of potential 'housing or employment' sites in the village. The Council will reach a view (taking into account current employment commitments) whether it is appropriate to make rural allocation(s) and if so where these should be. These will be published during the Preferred Options Local Plan consultation.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 9 No other areas suggested 13				
Open Space		Public	<p>Plan attached to this response (on Objective) Areas A,B and C should be acquired as public open space. There should be a bridge across the river between Areas B and C; and Area C would also have access from the public footpath between Lavender Ave and Saverley Green.</p> <p>1 East Bank Ride Grass area next to brook. Not shown on your map. 2 Caverswall Old Rd Grass area with trees 3 Recreation Ground Play areas, pitches & brookside 4 Elmwood drive Brookside open space 5 St Peter's Churchyards A North of Stallington Rd Rough area next to river. Should be acquired as public open space. B Blythe View Private. Should be acquired as public open space. C Blythe View Fields Horse Grazing. Should be acquired as public open space. D William Amory Pr School School Only Playing Fields E High School & Forsbrook Pr Sch Schools Only Playing Fields F Rear of Mount Rd Horse Grazing G Well Street Private Garden H Millpond, Stallington Rd If BB021 is developed, public access to edge of pond should be achieved. BB087 better located for traffic and access.</p>	<p>The options consultation map combined both types of open space (public- and visual-) under the same category 'open space'. The preferred options document will separate Visual Open Space and Public Open Space for clarification. The Council cannot include any areas in private ownership as public open space and has limited resources to purchase new areas.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
BROWN EDGE DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses:				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 3				
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>Boundary 1 - Extending the development boundary to take in the larger sites raises the question of the quality of the land concerned. In some cases e.g. BE032 it appears to be good, well maintained farmland which should only be sacrificed as a last resort.</p> <p>Boundary 2 - Brown Edge developed initially as a squatter settlement long each side of the ridge, resulting in a series of small and attractive stone houses. Nineteenth century prosperity led to some fine buildings being erected to the north of the settlement, the church of St. Anne (Listed Grade II). The Coach House (Listed Grade II), the School, and the Vicarage. These together with more of the randomly placed stone houses give considerable character to this part of Brown Edge. Should this part be included in the development area or is it best to omit it?</p>	<p>Boundary 1 - Brown Edge is surrounded by Green Belt. A recently published Green Belt Review has helped to inform the recommended sites for selection as preferred options. BE032 has been recommended for consideration for release from the Green Belt. The agricultural land classification of the green field sites have been checked and BE032 is Grade 4, which means that it is of poor quality. None of the sites put forward in Brown Edge (or anywhere else in the District) have a high quality agricultural land classification.</p> <p>Boundary 2 – It is agreed that Brown Edge contains a number of buildings of historical significance. The church, the school and the vicarage buildings are already included within the settlement boundary but more sporadic development along the eastern side of St Anne's Vale and to the north of the village is currently excluded from the boundary. It is considered that retaining these areas within the Green Belt will preserve their character. They are not recommended for consideration for removal from the Green Belt in the Council's Green Belt Review.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 2 No other areas suggested 9				
Open Space		Public	Next to BE003A.	<p>This land is in private ownership so there are no public access rights and in any case it is considered to be too small for such a designation.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	Areas on Broad Lane, Brown Edge	This area is within the Green Belt and likely to be in private ownership so is not appropriate for Public

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				Open Space. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
CHEDDLETON DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY				
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 71 No (amendments not required) 1				
Development Boundary		Cheddleton Parish Council	Boundary to Wetley Rocks to be extended to include both sides of Mill Lane from junction with A520 on the east side of the lane from St Johns Church down to lodge side and on the west side of the lane from the boundary of 31 Main road down to Foxdale and on the west side of the A520 from silver springs. The Council asks for the village boundary line to follow the existing line to the proposed new boundary line where it incorporates the property and land at the top of Mill Lane. With the houses already planned any infill sites in Mill lane will satisfy and meet the needs of this settlement's requirements. Council supports extension of village boundary and asks for Staffordshire Farmers site which is brown field to be included to form part of the new SM Local Plan.	The options consultation mapped 'draft' proposals for amended/new development boundaries. Public response to this will inform the exact layout of new boundaries to be submitted to Planning Inspector. Wetley Rocks - The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will also inform the future Plan. Note that land currently lying in the Green Belt west of the main road/Mill Lane junction (except for site WR015), were recommended not to be released from Green Belt. Cheddleton - With regards the Staffordshire Farmers site (CD030) similarly the Green Belt Review recommended this should not be released from the Green Belt. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	We are happy with the proposed boundary but it should be extended to include the vacant/cleared former depot on Cheadle Road opposite Pointon Park (known locally as the Staffordshire Farmers site) south of the village.	The options consultation mapped 'draft' proposals for amended/new development boundaries. Public response to this will inform the exact layout of new boundaries to be submitted to Planning Inspector. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>for the District. The results of this will also inform the future Plan.</p> <p>With regards the Staffordshire Farmers site (CD030) the Green Belt Review recommended this should not be released from the Green Belt.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Restore the village settlement boundary on Basford Bridge Lane - remove CD118. Remnant historic landscape as in SMDC LCA 2008 should be preserved.	<p>Note that the current Local Plan boundary does not include this site. Site options outside the current boundary that are proceeded with as allocations, would be 'rolled in' to the new boundary.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this site was 'not recommended for release' from the Greenbelt. The Council will also take into account its landscape character evidence base.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	The development boundary should be moved not to include CD060 this is pushing Cheddleton's boundary into the Churnet Valley.	<p>Note that the current Local Plan boundary does not include this site. Site options outside the current boundary that are proceeded with as allocations, would be 'rolled in' to the new boundary.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this site was 'not recommended for release' from the Greenbelt.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Sites CD118, CD060, CD115, CD002, CD003, CD004, CD007, CD008, CD015, CD017 and CD019 all entail development beyond the existing village boundaries and encroach onto the Green Belt. This is	SHLAA site suitability considers a range of planning issues as set out in paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY" document. Suitable sites can include

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			contrary to various Staffordshire Moorlands District Council policies.	<p>greenfield sites in the Green Belt. The NPPF does not dictate that sites in the Green Belt cannot be considered with respect to Plan-making.</p> <p>As set out in the Spatial Strategy of the adopted Core Strategy, in order to meet its objectively assessed housing needs, the Council recognises the need to identify allocations around certain settlements which wholly or partly lie within the Green Belt. Therefore in some cases Green Belt sites have been suggested (although the preference is to allocate non-Green Belt land, all else being equal).</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, the results of which will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that sites CD004/CD007/CD008/CD015/CD060/CD115/CD118 not be released from the Greenbelt; whereas sites CD002/CD003/CD017/CD019 could be 'considered for release under exceptional circumstances'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	It is proposed to extend the boundary of Cheddleton South northwards which risks undermining distinctiveness of two areas. Development of these sites is unnecessary as there are sites within the existing village boundary that can almost meet the entire 115 dwellings target assigned by SMDC to Cheddleton.	<p>It is not agreed that there are sufficient urban Cheddleton sites to meet the requirement alone. Whilst site CD069A could in theory extend to adjacent land, the notional area of this record takes into account topography/visual impacts.</p> <p>The Council must demonstrate to Planning Inspector at Examination that any proposed allocations as a <i>minimum meet</i> its objectively assessed housing needs for each settlement.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that sites CD017/CD019 could be 'considered for release</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				under exceptional circumstances'. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	Draft village boundary to be re-drawn removing the site referenced CD003, CD002.	Note that the current Local Plan boundary does not include these sites. Site options outside the current boundary that are proceeded with as allocations, would be 'rolled in' to the new boundary. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this recommended both sites could be 'considered for release under exceptional circumstances'. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 7 No other areas suggested 55				
Open Space		Public	Land surrounding on recreation ground near Cheddleton Park Avenue. Land near Ashcombe centre.	All current areas of POS and VOS in Cheddleton are identified as 'open space' on the options consultation booklet. Other land areas not identified as such, even if they are currently used for recreation by locals, are in private ownership. Land in private ownership cannot be included as public open space. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	Site CD115 meets the criteria according to the guidance contained within Review of Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment of the Staffordshire Moorlands, Visual Open Space	Many areas of open or agricultural land abutting settlements would meet the VOS criteria in the LSCA; the consultants only assessed existing VOS designations. When proposing site allocations for different uses of land (eg housing), the Council must be satisfied that sufficient land would be allocated, and in the most appropriate locations. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	According to the guidance contained within Review of Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment of the Staffordshire	Many areas of open or agricultural land abutting settlements would meet the VOS criteria in the LSCA; the consultants only assessed <i>existing</i> VOS

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>Moorlands, Visual Open Space there are four areas that would form suitable open space within Cheddleton North namely The plot identified as SHLAA site CD101; and The field bounded to its west by the rear gardens of those properties at the northern end of Ostlers Lane, to its south by the rear gardens of those properties on the northern side of Ox Pasture and to its east by SHLAA site CD101. The plot identified as SHLAA site CD118; and The plot identified as SHLAA site CD060. In addition to fulfilling the criteria described above the first of these two plots form a natural, pre-existing boundary between the old part of Cheddleton located within the conservation area and the modern developments further south on the western side of Cheadle Road. The maintenance of this buffer zone is a key component in preserving the character of the traditional part of the village. Furthermore CD101 is unsuitable for development, which Staffordshire Moorlands District Council appears to accept.</p>	<p>designations. When proposing site allocations for different uses of land (eg housing), the Council must be satisfied that sufficient land would be allocated, and in the most appropriate locations. Existing VOS the LSCA recommended for retention, is proposed to be retained as such.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that sites CD060/CD118 should not be released from the Greenbelt.</p> <p>The Council will also take into account its landscape character evidence base when preparing the new Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space	Land to the west of Cheadle Road, Cheddleton	Fisher German on behalf of Land Owner	<p>Object to the public open space designation of this land. The current use as sheep pasture is increasingly marginal economically, and the owner believes that the site could make a valuable contribution to meeting the identified local housing needs. The site is well located within the built-up area, and an attractive residential development, in tandem with the provision of public open space, would reduce the pressure on the Green Belt.</p> <p>It is recognised that the site has a sensitive</p>	<p>The options consultation map combined both types of open space (public- and visual-) under the same category 'open space'. The preferred options document will separate Visual Open Space and Public Open Space for clarification.</p> <p>The Council will review existing areas of visual open space as part of a forthcoming heritage and landscape impact assessment.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>setting - with existing housing on or close to all its boundaries - and is visually prominent, due to its rolling topography and proximity to public footpaths and to Cheadle Road. A Preliminary Landscape and Visual Review (FPCR Environment and Design Limited, 2015) illustrates how approximately 15 dwellings could be provided in that manner that retains views from the footpath to the east and existing hedgerows. Vehicular access, provided to the full satisfaction of the local Highway Authority, would be provided through the inclusion of no. 80 Cheadle Road within the development site.</p> <p>This part of the village is well provided for in terms of open space, and the provision on this site of public open space linked to existing footpaths would make a positive contribution to publicly accessible green infrastructure.</p>	
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
<p>ENDON DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 91 No (amendments not required) 34</p>				
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Endon Conservation Area consists of two parts. The larger part includes the core of the medieval settlement on the hilltop adjacent to the church, the sites of the early farmhouses and some fine later buildings. The smaller part contains 'the Village'. Both contain 16th century cruck buildings. Most of the suggested	The options consultation deliberately mapped all SHLAA sites deemed broadly suitable, of a minimum size. Suitable sites can include those within conservation areas: refer to paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY" document. Not all sites will be required to meet the village's housing requirement.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			development sites would impact on the Conservation Areas and/or on the landscape containing Audley's Moat (Scheduled Ancient Monument) apart from EN007, EN012, EN019, EN101, EN033 and EN024, and should therefore be avoided.	When drawing up its Preferred Options Plan the Council consults with statutory consultees including internal Conservation Officer; and also Heritage England. The Council will also be commissioning Heritage Impact evidence regarding sites, to feed into the Submission document. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Willard on behalf of client	Support proposed infill boundary.	Comments noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 11 No other areas suggested 27 Unknown 2				
Open Space		Public	EN128 should be VOS as it was in previous plan.	The site in question is designated as Visual Open Space (VOS) in the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (1998). The Council's Landscape & Settlement Character Assessment reviews all the designated VOS in the old Local Plan and recommends whether the designation should be retained or not. Following assessment of this area, most of the VOS criteria have not been met and it has been concluded that it is suitable for sympathetic development. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
IPSTONES DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 5 No (amendments not required) 0				
Development Boundary		Ipstones Parish Council	Village development boundary to remain as it has been.	Draft village development boundary included potential infill plot along Park Lane. Request to retain original boundary by the Parish Council is noted. If

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>housing requirement is met on an allocated site within the village not necessary to accommodate additional dwellings on the edge of the settlement.</p> <p>RETAIN ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY ALONG PARK LANE</p>
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The oldest part of the village lies around the church and the adjacent cottage (both buildings Listed Grade II). We suggest this area be removed from the development boundary in order to preserve its present character and allow for future consideration as part of the Conservation Area when its boundaries are next reviewed.	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment. Not considered necessary to amend the boundary.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	The paper response form has a site map attached which refers to altering the village boundary to the north-east of the village, excluding area from the village.	<p>Draft village development boundary included potential infill plot along Park Lane. If housing requirement is met on an allocated site within the village not necessary to accommodate additional dwellings on the edge of the settlement.</p> <p>AMEND DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY TO EXCLUDE THIS AREA</p>
Development Boundary		Public	The land at the junction of Shay Lane and Brookfields Road contains two cottages, one of which is late 18th century (No. 79) and the other of which was built on the site of a late 17th century dwelling (Brook Cottage - as seen in historic photos of Ipstones). The views across the parish council allotments from Brookfields Road to these cottages and the clusters of houses at this 'node', are of very long-standing and this is one of the best-	<p>This area is located within the Conservation Area boundary and comprises listed buildings. To be consistent with other areas around Ipstones suggest including this within the development boundary.</p> <p>INCLUDE WITHIN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>preserved parts of the historic settlement and key focal points within the conservation area. Brook Cottage was built against a former quarried outcrop. The land behind Brook Cottage and following the alignment of the brook was part of the access path to a former iron and coal mine - I own this site. The mine has been capped but in its vicinity are a number of outbuildings and a concrete garage, all of which vary between 20 and 40 years old, and which appear on the current OS map. These are all approached via Shay Lane and the drive leading past Brook Cottage.</p> <p>Given the importance and long-standing nature of these cottages to the character of the conservation area and the fact that they are not detached from the close-knit character of the settlement, these sites were developed from the 17th century, it is difficult to understand why the Development Boundary follows Brookfields Road and avoids these cottages and associated outbuildings. I therefore recommend that all of the buildings and outbuildings within this cluster are included in the Development Boundary. See attached plan. I am recommending also that the open space is protected (see comments below).</p>	
Development Boundary		Public	Historic Environment Character Assessment: Staffordshire Moorlands August 2010 identifies an area labelled IHECZ1. This area includes the site option IP012a and IP011 and extracts clearly identify the detrimental effect that	Comments noted. The Conservation Area is designated by a separate process and is not subject to consultation at this stage. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			development within this area would have on the historic and environmental character of the village. Why not in conservation area?	
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 5 No other areas suggested 0				
Open Space		Public	The open space that these sites provide are an integral part of the village and the footpaths through them are regularly used by local people and tourists alike. The site is used for parking for annual agricultural show which brings many visitors to Ipstones and provides much needed revenue for local businesses. The document Historic Environment Character Assessment: Staffordshire Moorlands August 2010 identifies an area labelled IHECZ1. This area includes the site option IP012a and IP011 and clearly identify the detrimental effect that development within this area would have on the historic and environmental character of the village. The conservation of the character of this part of Ipstones may be best served through the expansion of the Conservation Area.	Comments noted. The Conservation Area is designated by a separate process and is not subject to consultation at this stage. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	The parish council allotment/s on Brookfields Road should be considered for open space designation. A public footpath runs alongside this allotment and there are strategic views across this open space which are recognised in historic photos, published in various local publications – Bygone Ipstones. It is a focal point within	Open space includes a typology for allotments and agree that these should be included. The Core Strategy indicates that sites over 0.2 ha will be identified on the proposals map. INCLUDE ALLOTMENTS WITHIN OPEN SPACE TYPOLOGY

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			the detached lower section of the Ipstones Conservation Area and should never be developed.	
KINGSLEY DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 3 No (amendments not required) 0				
Development Boundary		Public	Why church/graveyard outside?	<p>The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). In a number of cases churches and/or their churchyards have been excluded from proposed development boundaries.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Prefer all farm building (adjacent to KG059 within boundary)	<p>The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). Agricultural premises are still 'greenfield', even if covered with substantial structures, and can be considered 'rural' features.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this did not recommend releasing any further land beyond the current development boundary from the Green Belt at this location.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Include sites near to school	<p>The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). Note the school, adjacent buildings, and playing fields to the east have been included within the draft infill boundary.</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that a land parcel between Dovedale Rd and Holt Lane was recommended to be 'considered for release from the Green Belt'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Shouldn't extend boundaries as roads cant cope	<p>National Policy dictates that the Council must meet its objectively assessed needs for housing. Currently this is 30 dwellings 2011-2031 for Kingsley (less subsequent commitments). In order to meet this need, the Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy recognises the need to identify allocations around the periphery of certain settlements.</p> <p>Such sites should 'relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape and have good access..', with a phasing approach prioritising (preferably brownfield) sites within the village first. Any peripheral sites subsequently allocated would be rolled into the new development boundary.</p> <p>The Council utilises its evidence base, including landscape character studies and the Green Belt Review, and also consults fully with County Highways officer as part of the Plan-making process.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	It is proposed the development boundary at the rear of Blacksmiths Farm, Hazles Cross Road is amended to follow the rear wall of the existing brick farm building. This would hamper the efficient re-development or refurbishment of the site and serve no effective purpose. It is suggested the boundary should remain in line with the adjacent garden fences as currently	Comments noted. The Council may make minor amendments to draft boundaries if considered appropriate, following review of consultation responses. Development boundaries are intended to draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of settlements. The Council will also consider the results of its recently published Green Belt Review [this does not recommend release of any further land from the Green Belt to the rear of this property].

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			designated.	NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	We are concerned at the extent to which most of the proposed sites extend into the Green Belt and into open countryside. Of the proposed sites only KG019 sits tightly against the existing settlement. Subject to its availability this would seem to be the least damaging site.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>SHLAA sites were identified/rated according to paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying “STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY” document including relationship with urban form; with all sites above a minimum size threshold attracting a ‘B’ deliverability rating, being mapped in the consultation.</p> <p>The Council must meet the rural area housing need for 2011-2031. The Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy recognises the need to identify allocations around the periphery of such settlements, including Kingsley. Such sites should ‘relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape and have good access..’, with a phasing approach prioritising (preferably brownfield) sites within the village first. Any peripheral sites subsequently allocated would be rolled into the new development boundary. Kingsley’s anticipated housing needs can be met with a single site.</p> <p>The Council utilises its evidence base, including landscape character studies and the Green Belt Review, as part of the Plan-making process.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
UPPER TEAN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 1				
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Concerns expressed by residents include the detrimental effect on land drainage of development uphill of the main settlement where they suggest that the introduction of hard surfaces has markedly increased the incidence of flooding adjacent to the River Tean.	The Council has recently completed a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and has consulted the Environment Agency, Severn Trent and the Local Lead Flood Authority. New development will need to consider Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) as part of the application. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Development Boundary		Public	It appears from the plan that the planning boundaries for 35 Cheadle Road were not recorded correctly at the last boundaries review, see the enclosed plan marked in red.	Extend the boundary to include garden area to 35 Cheadle Road. AMEND DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY
Development Boundary		Public	The incursion into special landscape area is shocking.	The Special Landscape Area designation has been superseded by the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. This is covered in Core Strategy Policy DC3 – Landscape and Settlement Setting.
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Waterhouses				
Development Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
WERRINGTON & CELLARHEAD				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 17 No (amendments not required) 4				
Development Boundary		Werrington Parish Council	Agrees with the proposed development boundary but believes that land/housing within parish boundary (Ash Bank road to Brookhouse Lane) should also be included.	<p>The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). The extent of villages does not necessarily relate to the extent of Parishes.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District which assessed existing Green Belt in the District against Green Belt purposes in the NPPF (eg check urban sprawl). The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that no land to the west of WE070 was recommended for release from the Greenbelt. The Council will utilise its evidence base, including landscape character studies and the Green Belt Review, as part of the Plan-making process.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Our main concern here is with the possible extensions to the boundary at the end of Washerwall Lane (WE019 , WE040, WE041) and any possible impact it that might have on Wetley Moor Common.	<p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District which assessed existing Green Belt in the District against Green Belt purposes in the NPPF. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that out of these three sites, only WE040 was considered suitable for release (under exceptional circumstances).</p> <p>The LSCA identifies most of the land covered by these three sites as 'important landscape setting to settlement'.</p> <p>With regards ecological interests, the Council consults with internal Countryside Officer, Staffs Wildlife Trust, and Natural England during plan-</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>making. Any responses will be publicised during preferred Options. The Council also recently completed a Phase I ecological study for the District which assessed the ecological attributes of the majority of options sites [including the three abovementioned].</p> <p>The Council will utilise its evidence base, including the above studies, as part of the Plan-making process.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	On the map it looks strange extending the village on a dog-leg out to the North. There are plenty of sites closer to the core services.	<p>The options consultation deliberately mapped all SHLAA sites deemed broadly suitable at the time, of a minimum size (as per paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying “STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY” document). Not all sites will be required to meet the village’s housing requirement. Also all options sites have undergone comparative sustainability appraisal the results of which will be published at Preferred Options.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District which assessed existing Green Belt in the District against Green Belt purposes in the NPPF. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that site WE033 was not recommended for release from the Greenbelt. Also the LSCA identifies the current development boundary here as a ‘strong edge to settlement’.</p> <p>The Council will utilise its evidence base, including landscape character studies and the Green Belt Review, as part of the Plan-making process.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Development Boundary		Public	Why is it necessary to adjust the current Werrington boundary when there are sufficient sites to develop without the need to destroy any greenbelt locations?	<p>The Council must meet the rural housing need for 2011-2031. The Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy recognises the need to identify allocations around the periphery of such settlements, including Werrington and Cellarhead. Such sites should 'relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape and have good access..', with a phasing approach prioritising (preferably brownfield) sites within the village first. Any peripheral sites subsequently allocated would be rolled into the new development boundary.</p> <p>It is not agreed that there are sufficient urban Werrington and Cellarhead sites to meet the requirement alone. Note that existing greenspaces in the village (including public open space, and any visual open spaces recommended for retention in the 2008 LSCA) are mapped to be retained as such as per Core Strategy/NPPF policy.</p> <p>Greenfield SHLAA sites in the Green Belt can be considered for residential allocation (the Council's approach is explained in paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY" document).</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations alongside its landscape character evidence etc.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development Boundary		Public	Appreciate need to amend boundary to incorporate housing.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Development		Public	Enough sites within current boundary.	The Council must meet the rural housing need for

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Boundary				<p>2011-2031. The Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy recognises the need to identify allocations around the periphery of such settlements, including Werrington and Cellarhead. Such sites should 'relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape and have good access..', with a phasing approach prioritising (preferably brownfield) sites within the village first. Any peripheral sites subsequently allocated would be rolled into the new development boundary.</p> <p>It is not agreed that there are sufficient urban Werrington and Cellarhead sites to meet the requirement alone. Note that existing greenspaces in the village (including public open space, and any visual open spaces recommended for retention in the 2008 LSCA) are mapped to be retained as such as per Core Strategy/NPPF policy.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 2 No other areas suggested 23</p>				
Open Space		Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alley way opposite Co-Op on Washerwall. • Millenium Monument adjacent to Stonehouse school site. • Old bowling green at the top of hillside. • Meigh Road playing fields (move to current green belt). • Former bowling green at the Ashbank pub. • Land south of Chatsworth Drive to Hulme End. All sites above (apart 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This alleyway presumed to have historic right of way for pedestrians. Not usable as open space. • Millennium monument open area already identified as public open space • Land in between Hillside Rd and Whitmore Avenue already identified as public open space • Meigh Rd playing fields already identified as public open space. Site falls within current/draft settlement boundary within built up area. Green Belt Review did not

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>from South of Chatsworth Drive) fall within the current village boundary and not on greenbelt land.</p>	<p>recommend this area be reclassified as Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at the Ash Bank pub is not currently identified either as a SHLAA site nor as open space. Presumed to be in private ownership. Intentions of the owner not known. Site lies within current/draft development boundary. • This site currently lies in the Green Belt and is identified for retention as such in Green Belt Review. Sites WE049/050/051 appear to be agricultural land in private ownership/ <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Werrington Parish Council	<p>Werrington Parish Council believes that land off Whitmore Avenue and Radley Way should be re-classified as potential housing sites on the basis that 'infilling' is preferable to encroaching into the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Existing greenspaces across the District (including public open space, and any visual open spaces recommended for retention in the 2008 LSCA) are mapped to be retained as such as per Core Strategy/NPPF policy. The Council has generally not considered these as SHLAA sites (or where suggested by others, classed 'C' so not proceeded to options stage).</p> <p>The Council must meet the rural housing need for 2011-2031. The Larger Villages Policy of the Core Strategy recognises the need to identify allocations around the periphery of such settlements, including Werrington and Cellarhead. Such sites should 'relate well to the built-up area, can be assimilated into the landscape and have good access..', with a phasing approach prioritising (preferably brownfield) sites within the village first. Any peripheral sites subsequently allocated would be rolled into the new development boundary.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land across the District based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
WETLEY ROCKS DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 2 No (amendments not required) 0				
Development Boundary		Cheddleton Parish Council	<p>The settlement boundary should be returned to its former line along the rear of the properties on Main Road. This would allow site WR002 to be allocated for housing development. This site, which presently lies within the village boundary, and outside of the Green Belt, would provide for 20 houses.</p> <p>I would ask for the village development boundary to be extended, to incorporate the properties on both sides of Mill Lane; from the junction with the A520 - on the East side of the lane from St John's Church down to 'Lodge Side' and on the West side of the lane from the boundary of 31 Main Road down to 'Foxdale'. I also think that the whole of the churchyard (being the corner of A520 and Mill Lane) should be within the village boundary, as should the whole of the village school site. On the west side of the A520 from 'Silver Springs' the council ask for the village boundary to follow the existing line of the proposed new boundary line where it incorporates the property and land at the top of Mill Lane. With the houses already</p>	<p>The options consultation mapped 'draft' proposals for amended/new development boundaries. Public response to this will inform the exact layout of new boundaries to be submitted to Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that site WR015 could be considered for release from the Greenbelt under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Moreover it also states that land parcel 'C11' makes a "contribution" to the Green Belt (based on safeguarding countryside from encroachment). As the existing western boundary line was drafted to accommodate the (now defunct) bypass line; it is appropriate to consider its current status during the Local Plan review. The land also arguably contributes to open views from some aspects, and falls within an 'important landscape setting to settlement' in LSCA. Note that part of WR002 already enjoys residential consent [SMD/2015/0122].</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			planned, any infill sites in Mill Lane will satisfy and meet the needs of this settlement's requirements for some time to come.	
Development Boundary		Public	Support the Cheddleton Parish Council's view on the Village Development boundary, namely to incorporate the properties on both sides of Mill Lane from the junction with the A520. This would enable a "ribbon" development infilling with existing properties without any spread into the fields beyond the rear boundaries of existing properties. It would also enable improvements and enhancements to the existing transportation/ parking to St Johns school.	The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that this land not be released from the Green Belt. There are substantial gaps along Mill Lane and it is not considered that this would constitute infill development. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space Public Responses: Yes (there are other areas which should be included as open space) 1 No other areas suggested 0				
Open Space		Fisher German on behalf of Land Owner.	Object to the identification of land to the east of Leek Road as open space. The Council's SHLAA assessment identifies positive aspects of the site. Although it is located in the Green Belt it relates relatively well to the urban form. Housing development would contribute to a need in the village and in all probability allow for the retention of the play area or subject to updated evidence on the need for play facilities the owner would be willing to re-provide them. A suitable vehicular access is available.	The site attracts a 'C' classification owing to its current POS status, and for other reasons. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommended that this land not be released from the Green Belt. The land falls within an 'important landscape setting to settlement' in LSCA. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
BAGNALL INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 5 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Bagnall Parish Council	Rejects proposals set out in the consultation document and will ensure protection of special character of village. Supports sites that would produce modest ribbon development. Petition signed by 90% of residents.	<p>The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Bagnall. Only minor amendments have been made to the infill boundary in the old Local Plan to create a more logical boundary.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This study does not support ribbon development around the village.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Bagnall Parish Council	<p>The present Bagnall infill and settlement boundaries are so tightly drawn as to permit almost no infill building. By default the Council is thus focusing potential development on the creation of mini estates on sites within or just bordering the current infill/ settlement area, which would change the historic nature and character of the village forever. The more sensitive and appropriate alternative would be extension of the settlement area and infill boundaries to permit sensitive ribbon development on land between the existing infill boundaries and the existing properties just outside them.</p> <p>The infill and settlement boundaries of Bagnall village could and should be</p>	<p>The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Bagnall. Only minor amendments have been made to the infill boundary in the old Local Plan to create a more logical boundary.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This study does not support ribbon development around the village.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			extended to: School Road between Fulwood and Bagnall Heights on one side and Casetta and Old Hall Farm on the other The undeveloped side of Clewlovs Bank from the village down to land opposite Windycroft.	
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Blackshaw Moor				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
BRADNOP INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The historic core of Bradnop consists of a small cluster of early buildings to the north of the settlement, Sytch Farm, Buckley Farm and the School Cottages, all Listed Grade II. This cluster together with the nineteenth century School (now used as the village hall), and the Methodist Church are of a quality that deserves to be designated as part of a Conservation Area and should all be excluded from the development boundary. If further space is	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			needed then a less damaging option would be to extend the boundary southwards.	
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
CAVERSWALL & COOKSHILL INFILL BOUNDARY				
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 9 No (amendments not required) 12				
Infill Boundary		Caverswall Parish Council	Amendment required to development/infill boundary – land at Green Farm Abattoir, Roughcote lane (brownfield site) should be included.	The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). Agricultural premises are still 'greenfield', even if covered with substantial structures, and can be considered 'rural' features. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this did not recommend releasing any further land at this location from the Green Belt. The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	All three of the proposed development sites lie inside the Conservation Area and are potentially harmful to the settlement form. A substantial new housing estate has already taken its toll on the Conservation Area at the south-eastern end, with direct impact on the setting of Dove House Farm (Listed Grade II). Further housing will shortly be available in the converted barn of	<u>Caverswall</u> The Council must meet the village's housing need for 2011-2031, which is 5 less subsequent commitments. The Core Strategy states that a review of existing Green Belt boundaries across settlements will be carried

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>Dove House Farm (also covered by the Listing). Is there really any need to impose yet more damaging development on this tiny settlement?</p> <p>Cookshill is a far larger settlement and substantially composed of 20th century housing. While the loss of Green Belt land is questionable Cookshill could take more development with less damage than Caverswall.</p>	<p>out as part of the Site Allocations DPD and the review of the Core Strategy so as to promote sustainable patterns of development around settlements in or on the edges of the Green Belt. Hence the publication of the Council's recent Green Belt Review.</p> <p>All SHLAA sites (above minimum size) attracting a 'B' suitability rating were included in the options consultation: this can include sites within/close to conservation areas or heritage assets: refer to paras paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY" document). The Council also consults with its internal Conservation Officer and other relevant heritage organisations during plan-making.</p> <p>The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new 'infill' boundaries meeting this requirement. The NPPF makes clear that LPAs must satisfy their housing (etc) OANs unless doing so would cause 'significant harm' in terms of wider NPPF Policy. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy.</p> <p><u>Cookshill</u></p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this only recommended releasing site CL004 from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic	The historic form of the settlement needs to be respected and given visual	SHLAA sites are identified/rated according to paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
		Buildings Trust	separation from new housing estates. This has so far been achieved by flanking the Conservation Area to east and west but respecting its relationship to the open countryside to the north and south. Development of CK007 would destroy this relationship.	<p>HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY” document; and including relationship to built form. All sites (above minimum size) attracting a ‘B’ deliverability rating were mapped.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this did not recommend releasing CK007 from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc. The Council also consults with its internal Conservation Officer and other relevant heritage organisations during plan-making.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	Existing boundary should be retained. The housing requirement for Caverswall could be met by infilling within the existing village boundaries. The existing boundary would already fit the proposed housing 2011 - 2031. Retain boundary as one village	<p>The Council must meet the village’s housing need for 2011-2031, which is 5 less subsequent commitments.</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that a review of existing Green Belt boundaries across settlements will be carried out as part of the Site Allocations DPD and the review of the Core Strategy so as to promote sustainable patterns of development around settlements in or on the edges of the Green Belt. Hence the publication of the Council’s recent Green Belt Review.</p> <p>The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new ‘infill’ boundaries meeting this requirement. Although this is a broadbrush target. The NPPF makes clear that LPAs must satisfy their housing (etc) OANs unless doing so would cause ‘significant harm’ in terms of wider NPPF Policy.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	Land at Green Farm Abattoir should be	The draft development boundary must draw a

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			included in infill boundary.	<p>reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). Agricultural premises are still 'greenfield', even if covered with substantial structures, and can be considered 'rural' features.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this did not recommend releasing any further land at this location from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Checkley				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>CONSALL INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) No (amendments not required)</p>				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Infill Boundary		Consall Parish Council	Boundary needs to be enlarged as no room for infill.	<p>The draft development boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). Agricultural premises are still 'greenfield', even if covered with substantial structures, and can be considered 'rural' features.</p> <p>There is a broadbrush target for around 5 dwellings.. The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new 'infill' boundaries meeting this requirement. The NPPF makes clear that LPAs must satisfy their housing (etc) OANs unless doing so would cause 'significant harm' in terms of wider NPPF Policy.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>Until the 20th century the hamlet at Consall consisted of Upper Farm, Middle Farm (Listed Grade II) and Lower Farm (Listed Grade II) and their farm cottages some of which can still be clearly identified. Upper Farm is potentially an undesignated Heritage Asset and stands immediately opposite Ivy Cottage (Listed Grade II). This hamlet lies in the Green Belt and has already seen as much new building as it can take without serious damage to its essential character. Is a development boundary really appropriate here? It could lead to pressure from developers to knock down unlisted buildings and free up sites, thus destroying the whole character of the settlement. The western part round Ivy Cottage would be particularly vulnerable to this.</p>	<p>The village was identified as a 'smaller village' under Policies SS6/ SS6B Core Strategy, therefore attracting a new infill boundary. Identification of villages in the Core Strategy Spatial Strategy (as opposed to smaller, non-identified settlements) was based on a combination of factors, including village population, range of services, accessibility etc.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this identified land parcels C14 & C15 as making a 'contribution' to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>The results of this will be fed into decision-making over site allocations, alongside its landscape character evidence etc. The Council also consults with its internal Conservation Officer and other relevant heritage organisations during plan-making.</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Cotton				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
DILHORNE INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 2 No (amendments not required) 1				
Infill Boundary		Dilhorne Parish Council	Primarily a linear village and majority of properties follow main route from High street, Godley Lane and down towards Godley Brook Lane. By doing this more properties in village will be able to take up infill options rather than being refused in past as outside boundary.	The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Dilhorne. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This study does not support ribbon development along High Street / Godley Lane. The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). As Dilhorne is so spread out and there are areas along Godley Lane which if included within a boundary would constitute wider gaps than infilling (i.e. 1-2 house gaps) for example the substantial gap between Home Farm and the next house along Godley Lane, it is not considered appropriate to expand the boundary any further along Godley Lane. Sporadic linear development in the Green Belt is likely to be harmful and is not in line with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in the Green Belt (NPPF para. 84).</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	We suggest omitting the south-western end of the High Street to protect the settlement form and views into the village.	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). It is considered that the draft boundary in this part of the village is appropriate as this area is within the central part of the village. There are policy measures in place to ensure that listed buildings and their curtilages are protected from inappropriate development.</p> <p>Once the preferred sites have been selected, the Council will prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the next version of the Local Plan (the 'Submission Version').</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Wainman Associates	<p>Objects to proposed development boundary and suggesting additional site not counted. DH001 suggested as alternative site.</p> <p>Home Farm Godley Lane SMDC/2014/0143 should be included. It is</p>	<p>The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Dilhorne. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development.</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			brownfield and would enhance the centre of the village.	<p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This study does not support ribbon development along High Street / Godley Lane.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). As Dilhorne is so spread out and there are areas along Godley Lane which if included within a boundary would constitute wider gaps than infilling (i.e. 1-2 house gaps) for example the substantial gap between Home Farm and the next house along Godley Lane, it is not considered appropriate to expand the boundary any further along Godley Lane. Sporadic linear development in the Green Belt is likely to be harmful and is not in line with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in the Green Belt (NPPF para. 84).</p> <p>The area of land which is the subject of the planning consent at Home Farm has been included in the draft infill boundary already.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	<p>More properties in the village will be able to take up the infill option as so many in the past have been refused by the Local Authority Planning Process because they fall outside the infill boundary.</p> <p>None of the areas represent what would be considered as being infill and would begin to build off the line of the road.</p>	<p>The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Dilhorne. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>study does not support ribbon development along High Street / Godley Lane.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). As Dilhorne is so spread out and there are areas along Godley Lane which if included within a boundary would constitute wider gaps than infilling (i.e. 1-2 house gaps) for example the substantial gap between Home Farm and the next house along Godley Lane, it is not considered appropriate to expand the boundary any further along Godley Lane. Sporadic linear development in the Green Belt is likely to be harmful and is not in line with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in the Green Belt (NPPF para. 84).</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	Former depot and lightly used farm land would provide space for 10-15 houses.	<p>The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to allocate land for housing development in Dilhorne. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to assess areas where adjustments to the Green Belt boundary to allow for development may be appropriate. This study does not support ribbon development along High Street / Godley Lane.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas). As Dilhorne is so spread out and there are areas along Godley Lane which if included within a</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>boundary would constitute wider gaps than infilling (i.e. 1-2 house gaps) for example the substantial gap between Home Farm and the next house along Godley Lane, it is not considered appropriate to expand the boundary any further along Godley Lane. Sporadic linear development in the Green Belt is likely to be harmful and is not in line with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in the Green Belt (NPPF para. 84).</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>DRAYCOTT INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 2 No (amendments not required) 0</p>				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>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 DC003 would damage to the setting of the building and could impact physically on the surrounding earthworks. We feel most strongly that it should be excluded from the development boundary and that an alternative and less sensitive site should be looked for.</p>	<p>The Council must meet the village's housing need for 2011-2031, which is 25 less subsequent commitments. Although this is a broadbrush target. The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new 'infill' boundaries meeting this requirement.</p> <p>All sites (above minimum size) attracting a 'B' deliverability rating were mapped in the options consultation. This was the only such site in the Draycott area.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy. The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
FOXT INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Foxt is a unique settlement having two elements, both dating from the medieval period. This is of high quality and designated as a Conservation Area in the Churnet Valley Masterplan. We would urge most strongly that the development boundary should be redrawn to exclude Rock farm and the Manor, both within the ancient enclosures of the Old Town and which could be put at risk by further development of a kind which may well be acceptable elsewhere.	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment. The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Public	The western infill boundary is acceptable but that on the eastern side has omitted SHLAA site FO003 which is available for development now.	This SHLAA site was deemed unsuitable because of its prominent position, and detrimental impact. The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any land subsequently allocated would be 'rolled' into the infill boundary. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
FROGHALL INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary	Froghall	Environment Agency	The Froghall draft infill boundary includes additional land in the floodplain and likely to be affected by flood risk to some degree and if taken forward will require the support of the Sequential Test and a Level 2 SFRA.	Comments noted. The Council will have regard to the findings of its recent SFRA and NPPF floodrisk policy during the plan-making process. There is a broadbrush target of about 5 dwellings. The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new 'infill' boundaries meeting this requirement. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
HEATON INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Heaton is a potential Conservation Area and such a generous development boundary could result in major changes to the character of the settlement. We would prefer to see it left without a development boundary leaving it to change gently through the current rights that owners have within their own residential curtilage.	The village was identified as a 'smaller village' under Policies SS6/ SS6B Core Strategy, therefore attracting a new infill boundary. There is a broadbrush target for about 5 infill dwellings over the plan period. The Council must decide whether it is expedient to allocate for this purpose; or to rely on new 'infill' boundaries meeting this requirement. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
HOLLINGTON INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The land around the crossroads is highly sensitive due to the presence on all four corners of listed buildings, the elevated nature of land, and its strong boundaries and trees. We suggest this area be removed from the development boundary and that other areas, further to the north where there is already new build, be considered. This is a potential Conservation Area and needs to be protected from over development.	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy. The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
HULME INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>We would be opposed to the creation of any development boundary for this Green Belt settlement. The hamlet consists of a cluster of farmhouses and their traditional stone buildings, together with a substantial and very handsome two-storey stable block of gentry origin. This dates to 1846 and presumably related to the Park Hall estate as it represents capital outlay of a kind not normally found in this area. None have statutory protection but several represent local heritage assets and deserve inclusion in the Local List. That being so the creation of a development boundary could result in major changes to the settlement form and character to its overall detriment.</p>	<p>The village was identified as a 'smaller village' under Policies SS6/ SS6B Core Strategy, therefore attracting a new infill boundary. Identification of villages in the Core Strategy Spatial Strategy (as opposed to smaller, non-identified settlements) was based on a combination of factors, including village population, range of services, accessibility etc</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will be taken into account in drawing up the new Local Plan. Note that this identified land parcel S1 as making a 'significant contribution' to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Kingsley Holt				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
OPEN SPACE				
Public Responses: Yes there are other areas which should be included as open space (2) No other areas suggested (0)				
Open Space		Public	Regarding KH009- Sharkley Meadow , is a vestige of open space that enhances the overall impression of Kingsley Holt. Giving far reaching Views of Ipstones, Ipstones edge, Foxt, Whiston , And Moneystone . In short it makes Kingsley Holt a delightful typical Moorland village. The Staffordshire Way. Passes through Sharkley Meadow. I am keen to preserve the integrityof this wonderful route through the village into the most beautiful Churnet Valley. The Staffordshire Way, is I am sure bringing in a great deal of invisible sustainable wealth in the form of tourism and passing trade.	The Council must meet the rural housing need for 2011-2031. A number of housing site options were mapped during the options consultation. Although it may not be necessary to allocate all (if any) of these. When deciding over options the Council reviews its evidence base which includes landscape character work, amongst other considerations. Note that if this site were to become allocated any existing rights of way crossing it would be protected in policy; and applicants would need to demonstrate how it would be maintained/diverted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
LEEKBROOK				
INFILL BOUNDARY				
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>We are concerned that the Local Authority are considering an eastward extension from the present industrial estate (LEEK EM2) reaching to the boundary of the curtilage of Fynney Lane (Grade II* Listed Building). This is an exceptionally fine 17th century farmhouse, well preserved both inside and outside; and currently survives in its original rural setting. The present industrial development already impacts on this and on the neighbouring farm in terms of noise, of pollution (particularly noticeable when material is regularly being burnt off between 5.0 and 6.0 am) and in terms of accelerated erosion to metal gates.</p> <p>While we realize that planning permission was previously granted in this area and has currently lapsed the <i>Employment Land Requirement Study</i> (July 2014) indicates that while there are growing requirements in the Business Services and other Business Activities sectors, demands for manufacturing sites is falling. The former could surely be accommodated within the town on former manufacturing sites including its redundant mill buildings, allowing much if not all of this site to remain undeveloped (<i>ELRS</i> p. 61, 6.20 and 6.21).</p>	<p>The site is already designated as a Broad Location for Employment in Policy SS5A Core Strategy. The justification for this (in summary) can be viewed in Appendix B Core Strategy.</p> <p>The 2014 NLP study identified a need for future employment land across the District (about 33.5ha) – which translates to approx. 10ha for Leek 2011-2031 [Policy SS3]. It also broadly suggests that in terms of indicative B-class splits, B2 uses should accommodate the greatest share of this (40%).</p> <p>The Council would not generally place restrictions <i>amongst</i> B-uses on the same site unless this was required in order to make development acceptable (on amenity or highways grounds etc). This could be achieved through the use of planning conditions; and assuming that any necessary IPPC permits on site are complied with.</p> <p>The NPPF dictates that Councils as a minimum satisfy their OAN for employment land (etc.) when Plan-making. The site is anticipated to accommodate the majority of Leek's (residual) additional employment land requirement; it is not agreed that this could be accommodated upon urban brownfield sites alone. Therefore it is appropriate to pursue its formal designation through the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of potential heritage impacts, the Council would assess resultant schemes against relevant NPPF and Local Plan Policy. It may for example be necessary to allow for set off distances/peripheral landscaping etc within the site. The Council consults with its internal Conservation Officer, and Heritage England. It will also be commissioning Heritage Impact evidence regarding sites, to feed into the</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Submission document.</p> <p>In terms of potential ecological impacts, the Council would assess resultant schemes against relevant NPPF and Local Plan Policy. Note that these policies do allow for development provided that 'significant harm' to ecological interests would not result (and even then, this can still be justified with recourse to wider public benefits). The Council would also consult with relevant bodies including internal Countryside Officer, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust etc; and review its own Phase I Ecological Study findings. Similarly, mitigatory/compensatory ecological measures could be provided on-site as part of a scheme.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>LONGSDON INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 4 No (amendments not required) 2</p>				
Infill Boundary		Longsdon Parish Council	Draft infill boundary should be increased to include Denford Road, Micklea Lane, Sandy Lane, Wood Road and could also include School Lane. These sites would assist with any ribbon development. The original plan cuts the accepted village in half.	<p>The infill boundary is not currently defined. As Spatial Strategy Policy SS6B identifies Longsdon as a smaller village and an infill boundary needs to be defined. The extent of villages does not necessarily relate to the extent of Parishes.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>'centre'. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to extend the draft infill boundary to wider areas of the Parish.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>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>	<p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. This recommends that all three sites could be 'considered for release' from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Note however that the options consultation mapped more sites than are necessary to meet the village's residual housing requirement, therefore it will not be required to allocate all three.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public and Ken Wainman (Agent)	<p>Query over infill boundary and private garden area (map submitted). North of Highfield House.</p> <p>Infill is the preferred method of accommodating a housing increase in order to maintain the natural beauty of the area. Therefore an increase in the infill boundary will be required to support a sensible modest housing increase. The larger the infill area, the better the imposed housing may be dispersed and as such all the roads in Longsdon should be considered infill candidates. At the very least, School Lane, Micklea Lane, Denford</p>	<p>The infill boundary is not currently defined. As Spatial Strategy Policy SS6B identifies Longsdon as a smaller village and an infill boundary needs to be defined.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village 'centre'. It is considered that a small amendment could be made in this location.</p> <p>SMALL AMENDMENT TO INFILL BOUNDARY NORTH OF HIGHFIELD HOUSE</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			Road, Wood Road and Dunwood Road should be included. High density housing in any part of Longsdon would destroy it's beautiful, green, relaxed, spread out nature.	
Infill Boundary		Public	To re-designate large portions of Sutherland and Leek Road as 'infill area' will result in dense building similar to that seen in the neighbouring areas. This would completely change the character of Longsdon village.	<p>The infill boundary is not currently defined. As Spatial Strategy Policy SS6B identifies Longsdon as a smaller village and an infill boundary needs to be defined.</p> <p>With regards density and landscaping considerations, developers would be expected to address the Council's own adopted Policy (see H1 etc), and NPPF.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Ken Wainman Ass	Objecting to exclusion of potential development sites on eastern side of Sutherland Road, Longsdon. This is gap site with possible extant planning permission for dwelling. Small infill sites would meet the housing requirement rather than greenfield sites.	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village 'centre'.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. Note that it did not recommend these sites for release from the Greenbelt. The Council will also take into account its landscape character evidence base in this respect.</p> <p>The eastern side of Sutherland Road is considered to be much more open in character than the western side. It is considered that there are sufficient and more appropriate infill opportunities within the draft boundary.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Infill Boundary		Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy	Objecting to boundary and should be amended to include parcel of land to side of High View, Sutherland Road as well screened, lapsed permission for one house and separate access.	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village 'centre'.</p> <p>The areas of land in question (LO016, LO001) are not considered to lie in obvious built up frontage, or obvious infill gap. Further LO001 appears entirely covered by woodland TPO; LO016 partially so (and suffers from rear overshadowing).</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District, which assessed existing Green Belt land based on NPPF purposes. The results of this will be fed into decision-making. Note that it did not recommend these sites for release from the Greenbelt. The Council will also take into account its landscape character evidence base in this respect.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>LOWER TEAN INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 1</p>				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	<p>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 	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any development proposals would have to be assessed against the</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>a tall Dovecote (Listed Grade II)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.</p>	<p>NPPF and Core Strategy Policy DC2 – The Historic Environment.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	The inclusion of site LT001, as well as LT002, within a new development boundary is an appropriate response to the need to find sites which can deliver the housing required by the Council's adopted Core Strategy.	<p>Comments noted. The inclusion of both sites is considered unnecessary.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>MEERBROOK INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0</p>				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The draft infill boundary abuts the southern boundary of Meerbrook Conservation Area (administered by the Peak Park) and	The village was identified as a 'smaller village' under Policies SS6/ SS6B Core Strategy, therefore attracting a new infill boundary. Identification of

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			directly affects the setting of two Listed Buildings (the Old School, and the Methodist Chapel both Listed Grade II). Development within the area outlined will therefore adversely affect all of these designated heritage assets. These factors and the small size of the existing community suggest that the creation of an infill boundary is inappropriate. At the very least all but the eastern section should be removed.	<p>villages in the Core Strategy Spatial Strategy (as opposed to smaller, non-identified settlements) was based on a combination of factors, including village population, range of services, accessibility etc.</p> <p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village 'centre'. Some smaller villages have a very low residual housing requirement; so the Council will have to decide whether it is expedient to make housing allocations in these circumstances; or rely on 'infill' opportunities.</p> <p>The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>OAKAMOOR INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 0 No (amendments not required) 0</p>				
Infill Boundary		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	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			historic settlement. In determining the development boundary we suggest the church and its churchyard are omitted.	<p>policy including heritage policy.</p> <p>The Council is currently consulting on an Oakamoor Conservation Area Boundary (March 2016).</p> <p>The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary	Mr & Mrs Cresswell	Land at Stoney Dale near Oakamoor		<p>The draft Oakamoor infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability considerations including distance from the village 'centre'. Similarly potential allocations, where these are required, should reflect sustainability principles [refer to paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying "STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY" document].</p> <p>It is considered that the land suggested does not relate well to the existing settlement either as an allocation, or as an infill site.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>RUDYARD INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 5 No (amendments not required) 5</p>				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	Rudyard was designated as a potential Conservation Area in the Churnet Valley Masterplan, and final decisions should await the completion of the necessary Conservation Area Appraisal in order to ensure the protection of the historic settlement and its setting.	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy.</p> <p>The Council is currently consulting on a Rudyard Conservation Area Boundary (March 2016).</p> <p>The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	Site RU016 should be removed from future development or infill. Recognise need for development but RU016 is unviable site.	<p>The options consultation deliberately mapped all SHLAA sites deemed broadly suitable at the time, of a minimum size (as per paras 2.6 – 2.25 in the accompanying “STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: STAGE 1, 2 & 3 SUMMARY” document). Not all sites will be required to meet the village’s housing requirement.</p> <p>The Council will review the suitability/deliverability ratings of options sites in the SHLAA, following review of statutory consultee responses etc. Sites deemed undeliverable (unviable) would ordinarily not be proceeded with for future allocation.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
<p>Public Responses: Yes there are other areas which should be included as open space (1) No other areas suggested (6)</p>				
Open Space		Public	RU020 should be kept as open space.	The site is not currently identified as open space and is in private ownership.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
RUSHTON SPENCER INFILL BOUNDARY				
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 3 No (amendments not required) 4				
Infill Boundary		Rushton Parish Council	Amendment to proposed infill boundary is required (map enclosed showing correct Rushton/Heaton boundary).	The proposed settlement maps are only intended to illustrate the boundaries/allocation sites of the respective settlements. The extent of villages does not necessarily relate to the extent of Parishes. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	This hamlet started as a roadside settlement across the former Rushton Marsh. Here the oldest elements are a scatter of stone farmhouses including Hammerton House (Listed Grade II). The open spaces either side of Hammerton House are an essential part of its setting and should not be encroached on. The boundary should be moved to the roadside to protect its setting.	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc. Any subsequent development schemes would have to satisfy NPPF policy including heritage policy. The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will also inform the future Plan. Note that this land was not recommended to be released from Green Belt. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Public	The new infill boundary proposal will more than double the size of the village (excluding the Heaton Sugar St end) and will violate green belt. It also creates two disconnected centres	The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc.

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>for the village. The need for 5 new homes in Rushton up to 2031 can be achieved by individual infill construction within the existing village development boundary. The existing infill boundary (around Sugar Street) should be retained. Surely it is better to support infill development where there is a request rather than a group of houses with could potentially stand empty.</p>	<p>The Council must consider whether it is appropriate to pursue housing allocations, taking into account both residual housing needs; and infilling opportunities in the village. The Council's proposals in this respect will be published in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>Empty properties may occur both upon infill approvals, and upon allocated sites. Note that empty properties approved since 2011 would still count against the residual requirement.</p> <p>The Council fully consults with its internal Conservation Officer, Heritage England etc, when preparing its new Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will also inform the future Plan. Note that this land was not recommended to be released from Green Belt.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Infill Boundary		Public	<p>The planning permission is already in place. Rushton Spencer has more than the number of houses proposed in the local plan. No amendment is therefore needed for the development infill boundary.</p> <p>Given the small number of houses needed during the period from 2011 to 2031 these can easily fit within the existing boundary. The current development boundary should remain as it is, with small nos. of infill sites used from within the existing boundary. There is no need to extend the boundary into green belt, as the proposed housing can accommodated in the existing</p>	<p>The draft infill boundary must draw a reasonable line around existing built up areas of the village, allowing for natural infill gaps (but excluding larger open areas); and taking into account sustainability and heritage considerations etc.</p> <p>The Council must consider whether it is appropriate to pursue housing allocations, taking into account both residual housing needs; and infilling opportunities in the village. The Council's proposals in this respect will be published in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will also inform the</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
			boundary.	future Plan. Note that this land was not recommended to be released from Green Belt. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Public	Site should be removed from future development (not clear what site is being referred to).	The Council must consider whether it is appropriate to pursue housing allocations, taking into account both residual housing needs; and infilling opportunities in the village. The Council's proposals in this respect will be published in its Preferred Options Local Plan. The Council recently published a Green Belt Review for the District. The results of this will also inform the future Plan. Note that this land was not recommended to be released from Green Belt NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Public Responses: Yes there are other areas which should be included as open space (5) No other areas suggested (2)				
Open Space		Public	RS015 together with the present building would make an excellent open space and village hall site.	Comments noted. The Council does not generally have resources to purchase private land to create public access open space, unless this is linked to planning contributions from developers, or CIL funding. In these circumstances there would generally be reasons to justify this, ie a local shortage of public open space. The Council would usually support proposals to create additional community facilities such as village halls to serve existing villages. It is understood however the building is currently in use (car sales). NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space		Public	The one area of open space marked on the plans is not easily accessible.	The consultation included school playing fields as open space, alongside other, publically accessible open spaces. Whether these are made publically

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
				accessible is a matter for County Council LEA. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
STANLEY INFILL BOUNDARY Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 3 No (amendments not required) 4				
Infill Boundary		Endon with Stanley Parish Council	Object to proposed extension of infill boundary due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expansion into greenbelt. - Development very visible from north and north west. - Not enhance current village envelope. 	The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to expand the infill boundary in Stanley. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development. The expansion of the boundary proposed at Options Stage is now no longer proposed and the only difference between the latest boundary and the one in the old Local Plan is a very minor change to include a small part of a garden which was previously excluded to form a more logical boundary. AMEND PLAN
Infill Boundary		Rob Ford on behalf of Demon Pension Fund	Land at Stanley Moor - off Stanley Road	This location is in the heart of the Green Belt and is not immediately adjacent to any settlement boundary. The Council's recently published Green Belt Review does not support development in this area. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary		Rob Ford on behalf of Demon Pension Fund	Land at Stanley Moor - off Clewlovs Bank	This location is in the heart of the Green Belt and is not immediately adjacent to any settlement boundary. The Council's recently published Green Belt Review does not support development in this area. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	This is a Conservation Area. There seems to be no good reason for extending westwards into the Green Belt: the nearest field boundary would seem more logical.	The implications of the latest 2012 population projections for the District have now been assessed and it is considered that in view of this there is no need to expand the infill boundary in Stanley. The infill boundary has therefore been drawn tightly to only allow for very limited development. The expansion of the boundary proposed at Options Stage is now no longer proposed and the only difference between the latest boundary and the one in the old Local Plan is a very minor change to include a small part of a garden which was previously excluded to form a more logical boundary. AMEND PLAN
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
STOCKTON BROOK INFILL BOUNDARY				
Public Responses: Yes (amendments required to proposed boundary) 1 No (amendments not required) 0				
Infill Boundary		Leek and Moorlands Historic Buildings Trust	The convention used for the development boundary is indistinguishable from that used for footpaths and tracks so no accurate comments are possible. An area that should be excluded is the land at Mayfield (Listed Grade II) fronting the Cauldon Canal. The building is in a serious state of dereliction and its land has potential for the enabling development.	Comments noted. The boundary will be shown in a clearer way at Preferred Options Stage. The land at Mayfield is excluded from the infill boundary. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Public Responses: Yes there are other areas which should be included as open space (2) No other areas suggested (0)				

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Open Space		Public	Endon Riding School.	<p>This land is in private ownership with no public access so it is not appropriate to designate as Public Open Space.</p> <p>Note that this site was not an option (for any land use) for any of the identified settlements in the options consultation.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review has been undertaken by the Council to determine where it would be appropriate to consider amending the Green Belt Boundary and where it should remain the same. The Green Belt Review does not recommend removal of this area from the Green Belt.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space		Public	Land off golf club.	<p>It is understood that this land is in private ownership with no public access so it is not appropriate to designate as Public Open Space.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Swinscoe				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Open Space			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>
Whiston				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED</p>

SETTLEMENT		RESPONDENT NAME	COMMENTS RECEIVED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Winkhill				
Infill Boundary			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Other Areas				
Infill Boundary			Land to west of Huntley Lane, Huntley	This area is located in the open countryside. Huntley is not identified as a smaller village. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Open Space			No comments received.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED
Town Centre			No comments or amendments suggested.	Noted. NO CHANGE TO PLAN RECOMMENDED