

## Summary of comments arising during Parish Council Workshops December 2015

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
BIDDULPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADD3 - Officers explained that site identified as a result of Greenbelt Review findings; proximity to town centre. Access/highways still pending consideration.</li> <li>• ADD4 – Officers explained that pitches, playing field, cricket club etc would be excluded. Mid section would be developed. Questioned if access would be problematic, would it be through BD117.</li> <li>• BD117 – Officers advised that still an employment option. Only access point via A527. Country lane with signs to stop HGVs.</li> <li>• Education – Officers advised that new First School required. Complaints had arisen from Gillow Heath residents because of commuting to Oxhey and Biddulph Moor schools. Town Council support for site for new school at ADD3. Suggestion to enlarge existing first schools rather than build new. 250-300 new school places. Would have concerns about another Uplands development in Gillow Heath.</li> <li>• Officers advised there would be some allowance for windfall sites. Officers also advised of the number of current Biddulph housing commitments.</li> <li>• BD101&amp;BD102 – mill sites supported by Town Council development fund &amp; ‘Mill Triangle’.</li> <li>• BD062.BD068,BD087 – access issues relating to these sites. In particular BD068 Marsh Green Rd access would need to be doubled. Congleton Rd junction is hazardous. Infrastructure and access landlocked. It was understood sewage works needs expansion and may be the most suitable (or required) access.</li> <li>• BD083 – Officers explained that this was coded red due</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the town’s housing requirement – a small site windfall allowance will be taken into account.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review has been used to inform the colour coding of sites.</p> <p>Continue discussions with United Utilities regarding capacity / surface water issues.</p> <p>Continue discussions with School Organisation Team (Staffordshire County Council) regarding school capacity and future provision.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Suggested sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodside Farm, Wharf Rd (700 units). The area around Woodside Farm considered acceptable for further investigation in the Council’s Green Belt Review (to the north) has been investigated further. Land Registry searches have been undertaken in the area and owners contacted – responses are awaited at the time of writing. Some of the land is unregistered. County Highways advice has been sought and there is potential for access from Akesmoor Lane subject to road and junction improvements and a Transport Assessment.</li> <li>• Totters Caravan Park – advised that land now for sale &amp; possible Renew developer interested in the 11 acres. Previously dismissed because outside of current development boundary [officers explained possible inclusion within development</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>to GB Review recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officers explained that approval of Forge Colour Works cannot be counted against Biddulph requirement because of distance from Biddulph. It was discussed how Neighbourhood Plan boundary extends to whole Ward boundaries – therefore that site would be under further consideration.</li> </ul> <p><u>COMMENTS FROM HORTON PARISH WORKSHOP:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the town’s housing requirement it was questioned would windfall be taken into account. Also it was questioned when latest housing monitoring figures (of post-2011 commitments) would be available, as this is relevant to potential Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>boundary based on supporting documents i.e. GB Review].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meadow Stile caravan park was included in the revised draft of the Biddulph Town Development Boundary in the site options consultation however the Green Belt Review has indicated that this area should remain the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>Other sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BD069 – 30 dwelling capacity is indicative at this stage. Survey work would be undertaken to determine precise capacity taking into account heritage issues</li> <li>BD062, BD068, BD087 - United Utilities have not requested additional land for expansion and landowners are keen to develop sites.</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
<b>CHEADLE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about CH077B – if classed red will remove many objections.</li> <li>• CH128 – Site has been put forward as an option. Discussed potential link into SW Cheadle area. Question if ‘SW cluster’ approach would result in putting this school where others are already – argue this would cause chaos.</li> <li>• Concerns that Thorley Drive area is still a potential area for development. Questioned if alternatives are reasonably acceptable.</li> <li>• Query what is Cheadle housing requirement.</li> <li>• Discussion around pros and cons of larger developments versus scattered piecemeal sites across the town.</li> <li>• Interest in Cheadle Neighbourhood Plan – good idea because involves locals.</li> <li>• Discussion around lack of recent investment in the town. No population growth between 2001 and 2011.</li> <li>• It was questioned whether the 3 broad alternative approaches at delivering the housing across the town would need to undergo sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>• Disappointed that the Cheadle traffic survey only looked at town centre and School traffic further south not considered. Town experiences jams at certain times a day eg 3-4pm. Questioned where link road would link (ie Tean Road to west of town); and questioned if there would be other route options.</li> <li>• Consider that new housing in Cheadle is needed for children currently growing up in town. Also need executive housing to attract key workers, eg higher managers to local companies.</li> <li>• Benefits of new development need to be ‘marketed’ better by Council to change the perception of residents.</li> </ul>	<p>The Cheadle housing requirement will be calculated following the Council’s decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. The employment land requirement will also be determined for Cheadle.</p> <p>Further investigate the possibility of the SW option providing a new road through to Brookhouses Industrial Estate.</p> <p>Cheadle Study assessed traffic within the town centre and routes around the town. The survey was carried out over a number of days in term-time and school holidays and when Alton Towers was open.</p> <p>Continue discussions with School Organisation Team (Staffordshire County Council) regarding school capacity and future provision.</p> <p>Continue discussions with Severn Trent and other service providers.</p> <p>A sustainability appraisal will be undertaken to inform the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Interest regarding Neighbourhood Plan - Officers to consider how additional information and support could be given.</p> <p>Suggested Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH135a, b and c + CH134a and b to the north of Cheadle. The Green Belt Review has assessed these areas and considers they make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and are not recommended for release. There a number of other sites around Cheadle that are not in the Green Belt.</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p><u>COMMENTS FROM CHECKLEY PARISH SESSION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed concern about where new industry for Cheadle will come from (given employment land requirement). Recent JCB staff layoffs.</li> <li>• Should be encouraging night time economy in town centre.</li> <li>• Queried the evidence of need for new housing and industrial land. Officers explained about NLP work on Council's website</li> <li>• Queried if Cheadle requires new primary school, and if so where will it go.</li> <li>• Queried evidence regarding sewage system capacity. Officers explained about Water Cycle study and that Severn Trent required by law to provide capacity for new development. Also the role of statutory consultees, such as utilities providers, was explained.</li> <li>• Discussion regarding road capacities across Cheadle and concerns over volume of commercial traffic in town. Link road would be beneficial but needs to tie in with where new housing goes.</li> </ul>	
<b>LEEK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers provided overview of Local Plan preparation process; and review of housing OAN. New evidence documents.</li> <li>• Officers explained about colour coding system on map. A number of 'white' infill sites were mapped being sites within urban area not necessary to allocate to see their development.</li> <li>• LE150 - Questioned why site was proposed as mixed residential/ employment use? Town Council consider LE150 being 100% housing makes more sense due to proposals for the Cornhill link road to the west opening up employment land. Who are the current owners?</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the town's housing requirement – a small site windfall allowance will be taken into account.</p> <p>The review of the Leek Green Belt boundary will be based on findings/recommendations of GB Review, however not much change is anticipated for Leek.</p> <p>Continue discussions with School Organisation Team (Staffordshire County Council) regarding school capacity and future provision.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council)</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the required new school was discussed – this should preferably be close to new housing. There is likely to be the need for a new first school and the expansion of the existing middle school.</li> <li>• Greenbelt – officers explained that only one option site lies in the greenbelt (LE103=RED). It was questioned whether the greenbelt boundary around west Leek was likely to change?</li> <li>• Ecology – Officers discussed the individual site results for the recently completed Phase I Ecology study for the District: there were ecology issues associated with the sites at/around protected SBI areas at Ladydale and Fowlchurch.</li> <li>• Questioned whether eastern sites (LE140/LE128/LE069/LE127) had willing landowners – Officers checked against summary table/SHLAA records.</li> <li>• Town Council consider there is a real issue about pedestrian safety along Mount Road.</li> <li>• Questioned why land in between LE128&amp;LE069 not included?</li> </ul>	<p>where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LE150 – the District Council needs to identify sufficient housing and employment land for the needs of Leek and this area is currently mixed-use. The current landowner is believed to be the Co-op.</li> <li>• LE128&amp;LE069 - site been put forward by landowner however there are TPO issues affecting site which would affect if/how it could be developed.</li> </ul>
<b>ALTON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was questioned whether SMDC have considered if new development is required.</li> <li>• AL012 – site supported.</li> <li>• AL019 – significant access problems. Habitat would be destroyed. Main sewer on site. Flooding issues.</li> <li>• AL022 - significant access problems. Habitat would be destroyed. Main sewer on site. Flooding issues.</li> <li>• AL024 – TPO on site.</li> <li>• Alton has recently lost a bus service and there are traffic issues along Saltersford Lane.</li> <li>• Plenty of brownfield sites elsewhere.</li> <li>• Support for employment in larger villages.</li> </ul>	<p>The Alton housing requirement will be calculated following the Council's decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016.</p> <p>Site AL012 has planning permission granted although a decision notice has not yet been issued.</p> <p>Continue discussions with United Utilities regarding capacity / surface water issues.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>The Ecology Study has undertaken a Phase 1 Assessment of sites.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
<b>BIDDULPH MOOR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BM013 &amp; BM029 – it was discussed that the yield from both green sites is more than required; or maybe significant proportion of both sites could be landscaped. Locals not supportive of large number of houses. Prefer infill with only 1-2 dwellings developed each year. Concerns schools will be overwhelmed.</li> <li>• Access – Hot Lane is not possible. Rudyard Rd traffic difficult. Because of public transport situation, sites incorporating 33% affordable/starter housing would require cars or be stranded.</li> <li>• It was suggested that land next to Parklands ribbon or on Farm Side Lane could accommodate ribbon development (10 dwellings).</li> <li>• Development should be phased over time as infill sites rather than 200 dwellings in one go.</li> <li>• Support for starter homes and bungalows for older people which would free up family homes.</li> </ul>	<p>Need to refer to the recommendation if sites are taken forward.</p> <p>Biddulph Moor is a larger village and has comparatively good facilities and services for a settlement of its size. Although the village is surrounded by Green Belt the Green Belt Review has identified two sites that could be considered for release.</p> <p>The allocation of a larger site would be likely to have infrastructure benefits, such as a contribution towards highway improvements, new school places compared to individual plots. Landscaping could also help to mitigate any landscape impact.</p> <p>Continue discussions with School Organisation Team (Staffordshire County Council) regarding school capacity and future provision.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p>
<b>BLYTHE BRIDGE AND FORSBROOK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most public objections received were about flooding BB054 (green coding). Questioned how the functional floodplain was determined/evidenced? Concerns relating to Draycott Old Road.</li> <li>• It was questioned where the current housing needs figure for BB&amp;FB comes from; and also as to whether intervening planning approvals were deducted from this?</li> <li>• Various recent evidence documents prepared by SMDC were requested by the Parish Council, to help with their own deliberations. Cannot make informed decision without them.</li> <li>• Concern over local road network which is extremely dangerous and can be very congested. Any accidents on A50 affects village. Cheadle/JCB produces a lot of through-traffic.</li> <li>• Concerns that there will be County funding cuts in relation to</li> </ul>	<p>With regard to information requested – no other traffic studies are available for Blythe Bridge area.</p> <p>The BB&amp;FB housing requirement will be calculated following the Council's decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. Housing completions and planning approvals since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into this.</p> <p>Various evidence base studies including the Green Belt Review and the updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (which covers functional floodplains) are available on the Council's website.</p> <p>Continue to pursue landowner intentions where necessary.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>local highways maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BB054 – if 150 houses approved, this will impact upon Blythe Bridge [Cheadle Rd to Brookhouses]. Better option in terms of traffic is Draycott Old Road, out onto A50, by Chardni cottage.</li> <li>• Commented that both ADD10+ADD11 sites would be sufficient to meet village requirement but landowner stated not available.</li> <li>• BB040 - PC advise that they know identity of landowner but are unsure of their intentions regarding future development of site.</li> <li>• BB045 – query whether land may be consecrated (Dilhorne Church), and if so whether this has a bearing. Point out that Foxfield Rd very narrow (one car width lanes). Also greenbelt concerns.</li> <li>• Greenfield site off Caverswall Rd. Road system changes/improvements would be required before new housing. Roads not conducive. Trucks etc.</li> <li>• Traveller sites - PC have concerns regarding impacts of any new traveller sites upon existing community.</li> </ul>	
<b>BROWN EDGE</b>		<p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Continue discussions regarding surface water and flooding issues with Local Lead Flood Authority and Severn Trent.</p>
<b>CHEDDLETON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CD003 – PC disagree with Greenbelt Review. Do not consider site should be acceptable for development. It has a dangerous access – onto 50mph road and development would link (coalesce) Cheddleton with Wetley Rocks. This would create a precedent (and has been refused previously).</li> <li>• CD115 – PC disagree with GB Review that recommends this site meets GB purposes, and therefore should be retained as GB. Site extends core of village.</li> </ul>	<p>The Cheddleton housing requirement will be calculated following the Council's decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. Housing completions and planning approvals since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into this. There are considered to be enough 'green' options in Cheddleton to meet the anticipated requirement.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CD017 – PC view this as acceptable for development.</li> <li>• CD030 – farm site depot more acceptable due to roundabout. Questioned whether there were sufficient green sites to meet village need?</li> <li>• Odour/amenity – Environment Agency have suggested odour issues/complaints would arise if sites at core of village developed. However PC view is most complaints are of HGVs carrying offal – there are few complaints concerning factory itself.</li> <li>• Housing need – it was questioned how many houses District currently requires.</li> <li>• PC Preferred site options: CD115 and CD017 together would meet village housing target.</li> <li>• CD118 – it was questioned why this was split from site CD060?</li> </ul>	<p>Continue to pursue landowner intentions where necessary.</p> <p>Continue to liaise with Environment Agency regarding potential sites in close proximity to Pointons.</p> <p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CD003 /CD115 – the Council’s Green Belt Review has assessed both sites and concludes that CD003 makes a moderate contribution and CD115 makes a significant contribution towards Green Belt objectives.</li> <li>• CD030 - site required to be cleared to form open space as part of Energy Centre planning approval S106. This is not identified as an option.</li> <li>• CD118/CD060 - notional split of record to show possible smaller ribbon development, without development of CD060.</li> </ul>
<b>ENDON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers advised that housing completions and commitments would be deducted from village requirement. Also that the apportionment of the rural housing requirement between identified settlements would be reconsidered in the Local Plan Review.</li> <li>• PC sought explanation why sites apparently not considered that they had themselves suggested to Council, following their own extensive Parish consultation, which had collated residents’ views.</li> <li>• Officers explained that sites identified in GB Review for retention in GB, were colour coded red.</li> <li>• PC considered that it would be better to split housing requirement over a few smaller sites rather than lump on one site, which cannot be sustained by infrastructure.</li> <li>• EN101 – coloured green. Would meet village requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PC report that site received largest amount of opposition. Most residents objections included</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Endon housing requirement will be calculated following the Council’s decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. Housing completions and planning approvals since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into this.</p> <p>Sites identified by the Parish Council as options were followed up by Officers. A large number of these had already been considered previously and are documented in the latest SHLAA and assessed as a ‘B’ or ‘C’ site. The SHLAA will be updated to reflect this additional evidence where appropriate. Other sites not previously assessed were also considered, however, none were considered to have further potential. Reasons will be documented within the forthcoming ‘call for sites’ list.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Sites</p>



SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
<b>IPSTONES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC consider Ipstones can't accommodate more dwellings – especially not concentrated on another estate.</li> <li>• Suggest 6-10 infill plots is the limit as a number of houses have already been built or are committed. committed over past few years. Request to have the residual amount transferred to Foxt (as infill) for young people/people wanting to downsize. Important that any new dwellings are infill in order to keep linear style of hamlet.</li> <li>• Request a sensible infill boundary. Request that all village options removed and replaced with 'flexible infill policy' alongside giving residential permission for redundant barns in the Parish.</li> <li>• Argue Church Lane is not suitable because of traffic (gets congested/gridlocked), very narrow, no pavements. Belmont Rd not suitable as too narrow and has no pavements, problems for emergency vehicles. Members have agreed that none of the sites in Church Ln/Belmont Rd are suitable for large numbers of housing as road/sewer/electrical infrastructure inadequate to take additional usage.</li> <li>• Memorial Hall would not allow access to existing sewerage system.</li> <li>• Suggest that roadside units nos. 1 &amp; 5 of Far Lane Industrial Estate would be most suitable for small number of affordable houses (owner is willing); Potential to convert more barns. Suggest site near the Chapel could provide village parking and housing.</li> <li>• PC advised of whom owns IP019 (albeit unregistered). But owner of frontage land won't give access; and no access permission from Memorial Hall.</li> <li>• Advise can't develop the edge of the open field off</li> </ul>	<p>Ipstones is a larger village and has comparatively good facilities and services for a settlement of its size. It is not constrained by Green Belt.</p> <p>Service providers have not raised any issues regarding the capacity of the settlement to take additional development.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Continue to pursue landowner intentions where necessary.</p> <p>Draft village development boundary included potential infill plot along Park Lane. Request to retain original boundary by the Parish Council is noted. 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>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IP019 – part of frontage is in separate ownership and is unavailable therefore highways improvements would be required to gain access from Church lane. Land is not registered and availability unknown at present.</li> <li>• Far Lane Industrial Estate – site is in current employment use. Core Strategy Policy E2 safeguards sites in employment use where appropriate.</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>Brookfields Rd as the village own it and legal encumbrances to development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with local school numbers as many children in local catchment go to schools elsewhere. Advise local Doctors getting better with a new surgery in the Hall.</li> <li>• Boundary amendments – PC want original boundary behind no 70 High St reinstated [as shown on map supplied].</li> </ul> <p>Additional letters received from Parish Council to confirm the comments above.</p>	
<b>KINGSLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated need is small</li> <li>• KG024 – understood land not available. Surrounded by greenbelt [but within development boundary]. Considered as part of GB Review.</li> <li>• KG019 – PC consider achieving access needs further work. 30x dwellings on site problem on Haste Hill Ave if park on road – larger vehicles cannot get through – use grass verge. Existing on-street parking already. Greenfield site outside boundary; small area fronting Whinstone Ave, but remainder unsuitable. Objections raised re infrastructure; lack of amenities, flood risk .</li> <li>• KG049A – greenfield outside village boundary. Question if infrastructure can cope?</li> <li>• Some scope to develop frontage of KG005 onto Barnsfield Lane and KG026 on other side of lane.</li> </ul>	<p>Service providers have not raised any issues regarding the capacity of the settlement to take additional development.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KG019 – check if part of the site is playing field / open space and update SHLAA record.</li> </ul>
<b>UPPER TEAN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of housing already approved in UT012. Questioned why UT041 colour coded red? Potential application at Tenford Lane Upper Tean.</li> </ul>	<p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UT012 – planning application approved - currently awaiting decision notice.</li> <li>• UT019 - Opportunities for improving pedestrian links and potential parking could be investigated further.</li> <li>• UT041 – Highway concerns.</li> </ul>
<b>WATERHOUSES</b>		<p>Suggested Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG Tankers Site – recent permission requires the activities on</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
		<p>the site to cease and all vehicles to be removed once the site at Winkhill is completed. The site is in current employment use and Core Strategy Policy E2 safeguards sites in employment use where appropriate. The site is currently located within Flood Zone 3 which means that it is unsuitable for residential use.</p>
<p><b>WETLEY ROCKS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Councillor confirmed ownership of one site and confirmed its availability in the longer term (after 5 years).</li> <li>• Consider WR015 acceptable but access should be next to telephone exchange, away from cross roads. Also note there is a broadband box on pavement near here.</li> <li>• WR005 very steep. Argued development very difficult to deliver.</li> <li>• Consultation comments - It would be useful if SMDC could contact Parish Councils in advance to see if local consultation events are being arranged that could be publicised as part of materials.</li> <li>• Advise that there is a site in the greenbelt owned by SCC for a bypass, on which there is a new outline planning application - but this has not been shown on options map.</li> </ul> <p>Draft development boundary comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC query proposed development boundary – for example why is churchyard only half included?</li> <li>• PC don't mind a ribbon down Mill Lane, of one property depth, to go as far as The Lodge on north side/Foxdale on south side. Argue that Mill Lane needs widening along with footpath improvements (which could be conditioned under planning). This is also within Green Belt.</li> <li>• Church, village hall and school not currently in village boundary. Boundary should be extended to enable some infill as well.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree that consultation material could be shared with Parish Councils to help local events.</p> <p>Explore an amendment to the development boundary along Mill lane. The development boundary will be drawn to include sites which have the benefit of planning permission.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
WERRINGTON	<p><u>Werrington PC comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus should be on infill in Werrington, not making allocations.</li> <li>• Clarification needed on which Parish Werrington site options fall within.</li> <li>• Consider Werrington village boundary extends beyond that shown on consultation map – further west and south to Stoke boundary.</li> <li>• Stress the importance of residents comments as well as those from Statutory Consultees.</li> <li>• Is the new housing at Cellarhead crossroads included in Werrington’s figures?</li> <li>• Is there any reference to funding for schools in the Core Strategy?</li> <li>• Re-iterate previous comments made to the Site Options Consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o WE033 is not with in Werrington Parish – it should not be included in Werrington figures. It should be in Cheddleton. But site is supported</li> <li>o WE069 – Site is supported</li> <li>o WE53 – object to site</li> <li>o WE052 – object to site</li> <li>o WE003 – object to site</li> <li>o WE013 – support site</li> <li>o WE018 – already has residential permission</li> <li>o WE027 – object to site</li> <li>o WE070 – object to site</li> <li>o WE019 – object to site</li> <li>o WE041 – object to site</li> <li>o WE040 – object to site</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Request further consideration of suggested sites. (Parish Council to submit boundaries of extra sites). Namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Field in Ash Bank Rd – support</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Former builder’s yard in Winterfield Lane –</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Clarification requested regarding the future status of the prison and if it could be included as a development site? Council has contacted the Ministry of Justice who have confirmed they are not aware of any plans to close this facility at present.</p> <p>The Werrington housing requirement will be calculated following the Council’s decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. Housing completions and planning approvals since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into this. This will include the Ascent site at Cellarhead and the former school site (WE018). There is a recent permission to remove affordable housing requirements for site WE018 (SMD/2014/0764).</p> <p>Sites identified by the Parish Council as potential options were followed up by Officers. A large number of these had already been considered previously and are documented in the latest SHLAA and assessed as a ‘B’ or ‘C’ site. The SHLAA will be updated to reflect this additional evidence where appropriate.</p> <p>In some cases the site is designated as ‘Visual Open Space’ in the previous Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan. A review of Visual Open Space designations is taking place and will be completed in time to inform the content of the Submission Version of the Local Plan.</p> <p>In some cases sites identified are public open space which are protected by the Core Strategy Policies (and NPPF). Although the quality of these sites may be poor at present, there may be opportunities to improve them in the future for local residents.</p> <p>Other sites not previously assessed were also considered, however, none were considered to have further potential. Reasons will be documented within the forthcoming ‘call for sites’ list.</p> <p>All sites within Werrington Parish aside from WE033/WE1</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Open space off Whitmore Avenue – recommended</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Open space off Radley Way</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC would prefer to retain Green Belt over retaining proposed open spaces in Werrington.</li> <li>• Concern that all sites gain access from the A52. A52 is getting busier due to Stoke City Council offices opening in Hanley</li> </ul> <p><u>Cheddleton PC Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WE033 - PC commented that they agreed with the RED categorisation of this site on the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>(Cheddleton Parish); and WE2/WE3 (Caverswall Parish).</p> <p>Funding relating to schools can be found in Core Strategy Appendix A page 166, App B page 183 etc</p> <p>Explore further with Staffs County Council if there is any demand for extra care facilities in Werrington.</p> <hr/>
<b>BAGNALL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bagnall PC advise that they consider Parish as one entity (including Stockton Brook). Were under impression that Council were proposing one allocation for the Parish and one for Stockton Brook. Consider combined allocation is too high.</li> <li>• Are critical of fact that Bagnall PC were initially only informed of Bagnall village site options, not SB16, in 2014. Argue that not all PC councillors may have seen recent consultation document.</li> <li>• Parish boundary adjacent to Stoke. Concern that affordable housing already available in Stoke near boundary.</li> <li>• Consider some scope for housing e.g. within gardens.</li> <li>• Consider that housing target for Bagnall could not be accommodated in village itself but could be within wider Parish.</li> <li>• Consider that Parish made up of number of areas (eg Bagnall Heights/Tompkin); Local Plan outcomes should reflect this. Clewlovs Bank should take some more</li> </ul>	<p>Owing to findings of GB Review, and for other planning reasons, no allocations are recommended for Bagnall. Infill boundary to be drawn for infill only – agree that there may be opportunities for infill within Bagnall.</p> <p>‘Smaller villages’ identified in the Core Strategy relate to settlements rather than parishes. There may be instances where there are two or more settlements, i.e. larger or smaller villages within a parish area. Also there may be instances where two or more parishes may overlap one settlement.</p> <p>All Parish Councils were invited to comment on the Site Options document which included all potential sites. A significant amount of consultation was undertaken at the site options stage. There will also be further opportunities to make representation to the Local Plan.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>development. Such small developments that do not encroach should be supported and count against overall target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over lifetime of Plan PC request more consultation over individual applications in greenbelt. PC-supported applications should be considered for approval by Council.</li> </ul>	
<b>CHECKLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rationale behind planning decisions in the Parish for conversions of rural buildings/empty barns to ancillary residential (eg for carers) was queried. Comment that approving barn conversions would bring in council tax and free up housing supply.</li> <li>Discussion about tourism proposals around growth corridor in SE. Questioned whether core strategy should promote growth corridor/ should there another tourism policy.</li> </ul>	<p>See policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Follow up other comments with tourism officer.</p>
<b>CAVERSWALL &amp; COOKSHILL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion regarding previous housing commitments: there have been a lot in the area since 2011.</li> <li>CV006 – constraints discussed [conservation area/access/no footpaths etc]</li> <li>A site recently given permission (14xno) but access very difficult and dangerous</li> <li>Greenbelt Review – this helps support decisions on site (recommending areas that could be considered for release). But other issues still to consider too.</li> <li>CL004 - Discussion around this site – in greenbelt; access difficult; blind bend; near listed building. Question if TPO on site [no]. Objections cover wide range of issues. Support in relation to locals schools, although local schools full.</li> <li>PC consider that if sites aren't suitable then line should be as previous (current) boundary line. Conservation area next to CV004, CV005.</li> </ul>	<p>The Caverswall &amp; Cookshill housing requirement will be calculated following the Council's decision on the overall district housing requirement at the meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016. Housing completions and planning approvals since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into this. Due to the large number of commitments it is unlikely that there will need to be an additional allocation.</p> <p>Any proposed Green Belt changes would not take effect until Local Plan adopted (2017). Developers/landowners will still have the opportunity to comment on why a site isn't included for development and be able pursue this to Examination stage.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was questioned how long greenbelt policy (restrictions) regarding new housebuilding remain in force in the area?</li> </ul>	
<b>CONSALL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC consider estimated no of 5 dwellings might not be enough, and draft infill boundary too restrictive – Discussed number of options: expand infill boundary; look for other plots that could be included within boundary; conversion of farm buildings and other brownfield sites.</li> <li>Query what type of housing would be likely to come forward and would it be affordable?</li> <li>PC advise that there is desire for local affordable housing because often new housing not lived in, or become holiday homes.</li> </ul>	<p>Consall is a very small village located in a relatively isolated located with few facilities. Heritage issues (listed buildings/ local character) have been raised by a local heritage group.</p> <p>The Council has less control over what type of infill development but if a need can be demonstrated an ‘exceptions’ affordable housing site could come forward.</p>
<b>DILHORNE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DH004 is not suitable – poor access (bungalow would need to be demolished, road is too narrow - Sarver Rd). TPO on site</li> <li>DH013 is not suitable for development – steep gradient and poor access</li> <li>Land to south of school might be preferable – in between School Close and DH004. Site is flat and has good access.</li> <li>Limited infill might be acceptable.</li> <li>Concern about the number of cars passing through the village. Any new houses should have at least two car parking spaces as all residents have to drive to access shops and services.</li> <li>Concern that water, electricity and waste water infrastructure is not sufficient for major development.</li> <li>PC advise land to south of school might be preferable – in between School Close and DH004. Site is flat and has good access</li> </ul>	<p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DH001 attracted a ‘C’ deliverability rating in the SHLAA so was not included as a site option.</li> </ul>
<b>DRAYCOTT</b>		<p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DC3 – issues raised regarding this site. Suggest infill boundary</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
<b>FOXT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foxt needs a proper infill boundary with a policy to allow flexible infilling (and residential conversions of redundant barns). Prefer infill to an estate or cluster of houses. Community don't want an estate or clusters of houses.</li> <li>• PC suggested boundary amendment to extend infill - boundary adjacent to 'Sunnyview' property within boundary – as owner agreeable to this.</li> <li>• New dwellings are needed that are affordable; priority should be given to the elderly. Consider an allocated site would result in large houses for outsiders.</li> <li>• Ipstones PC consider FO008 should be removed (in association with flexible infill policy) because important for Foxt to retain it's only industrial site.</li> <li>• Question where the displaced HGVs go if FO008 allocated/developed.</li> </ul> <p>Additional letters received from Parish Council to confirm the comments above.</p>	<p>only.</p> <p>Consider that the requirement for Foxt should be facilitated by an infill boundary rather than an allocation.</p> <p>Explore an amendment to the draft infill boundary.</p>
<b>HOLLINGTON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed interest in getting rural lanes around Hollington designated as 'quiet lanes'; speed limit reductions etc.</li> <li>• Preference for local residents to decide on where Hollington housing requirement goes through Neighbourhood Plan. Question whether current holiday lets could be converted to housing.</li> </ul>	<p>The suggested quarry site is currently in operation – would require SCC consent for other uses. A non-operating quarry would be greenfield in countryside covered by Core Strategy rural protection policies (also NPPF minerals policies).</p>
<b>HULME</b>		
<b>LONGSDON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PC advised that at a Parish Meeting a clear preference from residents for ribbon development and infill was expressed. No desire for a single housing site.</li> <li>• Draft infill boundary as shown does not relate to whole village</li> <li>• PC to submit suggested infill boundaries before Preferred Option (PC meeting on 4th February will agree</li> </ul>	<p>The Council must demonstrate to a Planning Inspector how the broadbrush housing target for the village would at least be satisfied. This may necessitate the making of housing allocations (in conjunction with housing within infill).</p> <p>Infill boundary can be redrawn to include potential infill sites, without actually needing to allocate them.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	boundaries). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development will benefit the village:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• potential for infrastructure improvements (questioned if this could include new sewer),</li> <li>• housing needs for young people to stay in village.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>LOWER TEAN</b>		
<b>KINGSLEY HOLT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADD7 – officers explained that site was put forward as part of consultation. PC queried if scale is too large given size of settlement. Outside existing boundary. Prominent position, greenfield.</li> <li>• Discussion about the field which received permission in 2013 for 7x dwellings – this would be deducted from 15x village requirement.</li> <li>• KH018 – ownership/landowner intentions not clear. Questioned if site needs allocating or could boundary line be re-drawn to include it for future infill?</li> <li>• KH009 – Happy with section that section of site fronting Churnet Valley Road to be developed. But believe owner is not making land available.</li> </ul>	Housing completions and planning approvals since 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into the housing requirement for Kingsley Holt.  Continue to pursue landowner intentions where necessary.  Infill boundary can be redrawn to include potential infill sites, without specifically needing to allocate them.
<b>OAKAMoor</b>		The Council consults with statutory consultees including Coal Authority and Minerals Planning Authority and their comments are fed into the Local Plan process.  Consider that the requirement for Oakamoor should be facilitated by an infill boundary rather than an allocation.
<b>RUDYARD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing need – it was questioned when the results of the recent NLP work on SMDC housing needs would be available for PC view. Also questioned whether housing approvals would be deducted from village requirement, and whether barn conversions counted [yes].</li> <li>• It was questioned whether housing allocations/approvals upon allocations would be affordable dwellings and how</li> </ul>	The NLP OAN report is available on the Council's website.  Housing completions and planning approvals since 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be factored into the housing requirement for Rudyard.  New housing would be open market, but with a 33% affordable housing requirement on sites that could accommodate 5 or more

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>the predicted yield is calculated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC agreed with colour coding for site RU020.</li> <li>• Discussion regarding potential future Rudyard conservation area – it was questioned whether it is appropriate to make housing allocations in such circumstances; and whether future properties would still be “affordable”.</li> </ul>	<p> dwellings. The predicted yield for sites is a broadbrush estimate based on the size of site and other constraints.</p> <p>Allocations can be made within conservation areas, subject to heritage and viability/deliverability considerations; and that the 33% affordable housing expectation on large housing schemes, would remain.</p>
<b>STANLEY</b>		
<b>STOCKTON BROOK</b>	<p><u>Bagnall PC comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mayfield site was suggested - derelict building.</li> <li>• Bagnall PC advise that they SB16 in Bagnall Parish – question who initially suggested site.</li> <li>• consider Parish as one entity (including Stockton Brook). Were under impression that Council were proposing one allocation for the Parish and one for Stockton Brook.</li> <li>• Would like to see small developments/infill only in the Parish.</li> <li>• Question why more site options suggested by Council in Bagnall than Stockton Brook. Are critical of fact that Bagnall PC were initially only informed of Bagnall village site options, not SB16, in 2014. Argue that not all PC councillors may have seen recent consultation document.</li> <li>• Argue that the combined housing requirement for both Stockton Brook and Bagnall (25 in 2011) is high compared to other Parishes.</li> <li>• SB016 - Do not know identity of landowner so think may be hard to take forward as an allocation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult highways access</li> <li>- Unsuitable because setting of listed building. Council should pursue reinstatement of listed Mayfield House. Brinley Bridge also listed. Will adversely impact upon unique heritage assets.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>‘Smaller villages’ identified in the Core Strategy relate to settlements rather than parishes. There may be instances where there are two or more settlements, i.e. larger or smaller villages within a parish area. Also there may be instances where two or more parishes may overlap one settlement.</p> <p>All Parish Councils were invited to comment on the Site Options document which included all potential sites. A significant amount of consultation was undertaken at the site options stage. There will also be further opportunities to make representation to the Local Plan.</p> <p>Discuss sites with Highways Officer (Staffordshire County Council) where highway issues raised.</p> <p>Continue discussions regarding surface water and flooding issues with Local Lead Flood Authority and Severn Trent.</p> <p>Consider that the requirement for Stockton Brook should be facilitated by an infill boundary rather than an allocation.</p>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing volume of traffic on an existing congested country lane.</li> <li>- In greenbelt</li> <li>- Request site called in for further analysis as consider has not had same level of scrutiny as other (Bagnall) sites.</li> </ul> <p>Parish boundary adjacent to Stoke. Concern that affordable housing already available in Stoke near boundary.</p> <p><u>Endon with Stanley PC comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mayfield site (adjacent SB016) was suggested - derelict building.</li> <li>• SB016 – considered appropriate for development. PC advised that landowner had recently passed away and ownership will change. PC to provide information if available. 20 years ago owner was keen to sell. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rejoining Stanley boundary- intrusion/ extension into the Green Belt. Questioned if an open field.</li> <li>- It was queried that if it transpires allocation of site is necessary why was there not more obvious consultation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Flooding concerns that drainage on the estate is only just coping- Severn Trent, Environment Agency &amp; United Utilities, surface water flooding &amp; any necessary works that may need to be undertaken.</li> <li>• Local highways infrastructure problems.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHISTON</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was commented that Whiston has a few sites that have planning permission or are under construction.</li> <li>• WH002 - (brownfield ex-copperworks outside boundary) suitable for development. Question why shown as red? PC view that brownfield so preferable.</li> <li>• WH016 – previously developed so suitable for development. No contamination/ has large pond].</li> <li>• Trying to develop garage site. Eyesore, needs tidying up.</li> </ul>	<p>Due to the large number of commitments it is not considered necessary to allocate a site or extend the infill boundary.</p> <p>Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WH002 – considered that this site is not required. Also contamination issues – but no highways issues.</li> <li>• Garage Site – this has planning permission (SMD/2015/0609) and should be included within the infill boundary.</li> </ul>

SETTLEMENT	PARISH COUNCIL WORKSHOP COMMENTS	ACTION POINTS / COUNCIL RESPONSE
	<p>Question if new draft boundary has been extended to include this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WH009A – greenfield outside development boundary, too close to village recreation ground - Amenity, landscape issues.</li> <li>• WH018 – greenfield, outside boundary. Support brownfield sites but not greenfield.</li> <li>• WH015 - greenfield, outside boundary. Support brownfield sites but not greenfield.</li> <li>• Discussion with officers over appropriateness of making future allocation in village given that it is not affected by greenbelt, but lacks school and other facilities.</li> </ul>	
<b>OTHER AREAS</b>	Kingsley PC question what is happening with Froghall – copperworks site?	As the site was identified in Churnet Valley Masterplan as an opportunity site it was not included as a ‘site option’. However the site should be included at the next stage as a ‘preferred option’.