

**MATTER 8**

**Allocations Cheadle**

<b>Issue 1 – Identification of Sites</b>
--

**1.1 Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Cheadle robust?**

1.1.1 Yes, it is.

1.1.2 The approach is the same for all settlements in the Local Plan and provides a robust analysis of potential sites for residential development in the District. The SHLAA (ED26.1) identified and assessed the availability, suitability and deliverability of land as potential housing sites and sets out a clear methodology. Appendix A and B provides a summary of the large and small site assessments and detailed assessment forms for the larger sites (ED26.2 & 26.3).

**1.2 Do the Green Belt assessments support the allocations in Cheadle?**

1.2.1 Yes, they do.

1.2.2 The Green Belt Review Study 2015 (ED22.4) assessed the area south of Cheadle against the purposes of the Green Belt and concluded that this area was suitable to be considered for release from the Green Belt if there were exceptional circumstances.

1.2.3 The exceptional circumstances for this Green Belt Release have been included in the supporting text to policy DSC3 in response to the Inspector's preliminary questions (MM51).

**1.3 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Cheadle?**

1.3.1 Yes, it does.

1.3.2 Policy H2 shows that a range of site sizes are being proposed as allocations for Cheadle – two large sites of 430 and 320 dwellings and five medium/small sites of 106, 51, 45, 42 and 32 dwellings as well as an allowance for small windfall sites in Policy SS4.

**1.4 What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations?**

1.4.1 Cheadle North SDA (CH001 & CH132) – Hybrid application (Persimmon Homes) Full PP for 125 dwellings & access to proposed primary school & outline PP for up to 175 dwellings and primary school with multi-use games area (SMD/2018/0180) – awaiting decision (Sept 2018).

1.4.2 Cecilly Brook SDA (CH024 + area to south) – Outline PP for up to 121 dwellings (SMD/2017/0660) – awaiting decision (Sept 2018).

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

- 1.4.3 Land to the rear of the Birches (CH013) – Full application for 39 dwellings (SMD/2017/0659) – awaiting S106 Agreement (Sept 2018).

<b>Issue 2 – Cheadle North SDA (DSC 1)</b>
--

**2.1 Is the development in a location that is or can be made sustainable?**

2.1.1 Yes, it is.

2.1.2 This is a key strategic site which is well related to the existing settlement and presents an opportunity to provide new housing and a new primary school to serve the northern part of the town. Current schools are located in the SW area of town and a new school in the north could help reduce the number of car-based trips / increase walking trips to school. The southern section of the site is located within the town development boundary and identified in the Core Strategy (ED32.7) as a broad location for housing. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (ED6.5) considers that the development of this site would have significant positive effects and specific mitigation measures identified in the SA have been included in Policy DSC 1.

**2.2 Should the site allocation be adjusted to incorporate land to be used for open space/surface water mitigation and/or land covered by the planning application?**

2.2.1 See response to Inspector's preliminary views on matters and issues (EL1.001b) regarding this additional land that falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3 outside the site. To clarify DSC1 includes sufficient land for open space /surface water drainage within the allocation and does not rely on the need for land outside the site to provide this. Any public open space outside the allocation would be in addition to that already provided within the site. Following discussions with the EA and the LLFA surface drainage infrastructure should normally be located outside the floodplain and therefore an amendment is proposed to the supporting text to clarify this (MM47).

**2.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?**

2.3.1 Yes, they are.

2.3.2 The policy requirements have been included to reflect the evidence base and are considered to be relevant site specific matters which need to be taken into account in determining a planning application. The Council has responded to the Inspector's preliminary questions in relation to the content of the policy and main modifications have been proposed to delete references to generic requirements which are covered by other plan policies (MM36).

**2.4 Should the policy include a requirement for the phasing of the school site?**

2.4.1 Yes, this can be included.

2.4.2 A modification is proposed to Policy DSC 1 to include the requirement that land and access for the school should be made available during the first phase of development to meet the requirements of the Education Authority (MM48).

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

**2.5 Is the site deliverable taking into account the lack of progress since its allocation in the CS and the requirement to deliver a primary school?**

2.5.1 Yes, it is.

2.5.2 Part of the site was identified as a broad location for housing in the Core Strategy (ED32.7). The Site Allocations Topic Paper for Cheadle (ED13.3) explains how the Council has been working with Staffordshire County Council to deliver a new Primary School in Cheadle which is now included in this wider allocation. The Viability Study (ED24.1) concludes that the site is viable. Supporting representations have been made by the developer / agent (ED13.3). The Council is in the process of determining a planning application which covers the whole allocation. See paragraph 1.4.1 above.

<b>Issue 3 – Cecilly Brook SDA (DSC 2)</b>
--

**3.1 What is the justification for including the two separate sites within the same SDA other than their proximity to Cecilly Brook?**

3.1.1 These two sites have been included within the same SDA as they share a number of bespoke requirements listed in Policy DSC 2 which are linked to the proximity to Cecilly Brook.

**3.2 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?**

3.2.1 Yes, they are.

3.2.2 The policy requirements have been included to reflect the evidence base and are considered to be relevant site specific matters which need to be taken into account in determining a planning application. The Council has responded to the Inspector's preliminary questions in relation to the content of the policy and main modifications have been proposed to delete references to generic requirements which are covered by other plan policies (MM36).

**3.3 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation?**

3.3.1 See response to Inspector's preliminary views on matters and issues (EL1.001b) regarding this additional land that falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3 outside the site. To clarify DSC2 includes sufficient land for open space /surface water drainage within the allocation and does not rely on the need for land outside the site to provide this. Any public open space outside the allocation would be in addition to that already provided within the site. Following discussions with the EA and the LLFA surface drainage infrastructure should normally be located outside the floodplain and therefore an amendment is proposed to the supporting text to clarify this (MM49).

<b>Issue 4 – Mobberley Farm (DSC 3)</b>
---

**4.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt?**

4.1.1 Yes, they have.

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

4.1.2 See response to Inspector's preliminary views on matters and issues (EL1.001b) and proposed modification (MM51).

**4.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP?**

4.2.1 Yes, they have.

4.2.2 See response to Question 4.1 above.

**4.3 Is the Council satisfied that landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, heritage, highway, transport and flood risk impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?**

4.3.1 Yes, it is.

*Landscape*

4.3.2 A site specific Landscape Impact Study (ED22.5 p.56 – 57) has been undertaken which identifies parts of the site where landscape sensitivity is low - medium and suggests specific mitigation measures which have been incorporated into Policy DSC 3.

*Green Infrastructure*

4.3.3 Policy C3 supports the development of an integrated network of high quality and multi-functional green infrastructure. The Council's Green Infrastructure Plan (ED22.10) seeks to develop a network of green corridors and green spaces and sets out details regarding implementation and the preparation of a GI delivery plan.

*Biodiversity*

4.3.4 Ecological survey work has taken place on each part of the site in the form of an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and a Local Wildlife Assessment (ED14.2, ED14.8, ED14.10). Recommendations are given for further survey work.

*Heritage*

4.3.5 A Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken (ED22.5 p 92-93). There are two Grade II Listed Buildings with 400m of the southern section of the site. The study concludes that the site is suitable for development in heritage terms subject to appropriate masterplanning and suggests specific mitigation measures which have been incorporated into Policy DSC 3.

*Highway and Transport*

4.3.6 County Highways have been consulted throughout the plan preparation process and have stated that development of the site would be acceptable in principle subject to access design and Transport Assessment (ED13.3). Policy DSC 3 and the supporting text set out further details regarding the access roads within the site. Also see Question 7.2 below regarding the future link road.

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

*Flood Risk*

4.3.7 The whole site is within flood Zone 1 (i.e. low probability of flooding). There is a main river located to the west of the site and evidence of some surface water flooding on the southern part of the site. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required and discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority as early as possible to discuss SuDS. Further detail has been included in Policy DSC 3 and the supporting text.

**4.4 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?**

4.4.1 Yes, they are.

4.4.2 The policy requirements have been included to reflect the evidence base and are considered to be relevant site specific matters which need to be taken into account in determining a planning application. The Council has responded to the Inspector's preliminary questions in relation to the content of the policy and main modifications have been proposed to delete references to generic requirements which are covered by other plan policies (MM36).

**4.5 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation?**

4.5.1 See response to Inspector's preliminary views on matters and issues (EL1.001b) regarding this additional land that falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3 outside the site. To clarify DSC3 includes sufficient land for open space /surface water drainage within the allocation and does not rely on the need for land outside the site to provide this. Any public open space outside the allocation would be in addition to that already provided within the site. Following discussions with the EA and the LLFA surface drainage infrastructure should normally be located outside the floodplain and therefore an amendment is proposed to the supporting text to clarify this (MM52).

**4.6 Should the disused railway line to the north of the allocation be included as GI?**

4.6.1 Yes, it can.

4.6.2 The Council's GI Strategy (ED22.10) identifies part of the railway line south from Cheadle as a 'key green travel route' however it is not identified as part of the Strategic GI Network. This can be added into the GI delivery plan for the Cheadle area.

**4.7 Would delivery of sufficient housing numbers in Cheadle, the site and the link road be assisted by the inclusion of additional land within the allocation?**

4.7.1 No additional land is required.

4.7.2 The area outside the allocation is within Green Belt. The 2012 NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. There are not considered to be exceptional circumstances to justify taking additional land out of the Green Belt and there are other housing sites available in Cheadle not located in the Green Belt.

**4.8 Is the site deliverable taking into account different ownerships including land required for access?**

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

4.8.1 Yes, it is.

4.8.2 The site is within two separate ownerships. Agents on behalf of both landowners submitted representations to the Preferred Options Local Plan (July 2017) which support the inclusion of this site as a strategic allocation (ED13.3). The agent on behalf of the landowners of CH128 state that they wish to co-operate with adjacent landowners and recognised the contribution to forming the access to the wider site. The supporting text to Policy DSC 3 states that owners will be encouraged to enter into a Land Equalisation Agreement to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits to landowners. The Viability Study (ED24.1) considers that the site is viable.

**4.9 Are the density assumptions reasonable?**

4.9.1 Yes, they are.

4.9.2 Policy DSC3 allows flexibility by the inclusion of 'approximately 430 dwellings'. The housing capacity for the site reflects the need to accommodate a buffer strip adjacent to the river, potential future link road, areas of open space/SUDs and landscaping. The Viability Study (ED24.1) assumes this to be 34.4 dwellings per hectare after taking into account these other considerations.

<b>Issue 5 - Land at New Haden Road (DSC 4)</b>
---

**5.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?**

5.1.1 Yes, they are.

5.1.2 The policy requirements have been included to reflect the evidence base and are considered to be relevant site specific matters which need to be taken into account in determining a planning application. The Council has responded to the Inspector's preliminary questions in relation to the content of the policy and main modifications have been proposed to delete references to generic requirements which are covered by other plan policies (MM36).

**5.2 Can a safe and suitable access be achieved to the site?**

5.2.1 Yes, it can.

5.2.2 See response to Inspectors preliminary question 130 (EL1.001b).

<b>Issue 6 – Housing allocation at Stoddards Depot (CH015)</b>
--

**6.1 Is the Stoddards Depot site (CH015) deliverable taking into account contamination issues and other abnormal costs?**

6.1.1 Yes, it is.

6.1.2 The viability assessment (ED24.1) for Stoddards Depot reflects its use for industrial purposes and hence the anticipated risks in developing such sites. The construction cost assessment at Appendix 7 is inclusive of a reasonable allowance for dealing with demolition, clearance and remediation. The

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

results of the viability assessment for this site are contained in table 7.24. As noted at 7.127 the development of the site is viable.

<b>Issue 7 – Infrastructure</b>
---------------------------------

**7.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in Cheadle be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?**

7.1.1 Yes, it will.

7.1.2 Policy SS12 states that development proposals will be required to provide, or meet the reasonable costs of providing the on-site and off-site infrastructure, facilities and/or mitigation necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.

7.1.3 The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (ED8.2) that sets out the level of new or improved infrastructure required to deliver the Local Plan. It has been produced through a proactive and on-going process of engagement with all infrastructure providers, including those involved in delivering health, education, utility and highway infrastructure. Table 43 of the IDP (page 131) sets out a schedule of infrastructure requirements, with costings and delivery agencies identified where known. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure the right infrastructure will be delivered in the right place and at the right time.

**7.2 Is the new link road in Cheadle necessary, viable and deliverable within the plan period? (Note – the link road is described as ‘desirable’ infrastructure in the IDP, not ‘essential’)**

7.2.1 Policy DSC 3 does not require the construction of a new link road but requires the construction of development access roads along the safeguarded route for a potential future link road of a sufficient design standard to facilitate a link road. For this reason it is listed as ‘desirable’ in the IDP (ED8.2). Further details regarding the link road are included in the Site Allocations Topic Paper for Cheadle (ED13.3) section 8.25 – 8.27.

**7.3 Will development lead to severe residual highway impacts in Cheadle taking into account improvements that can be undertaken to the transport network?**

7.3.1 No, it will not.

7.3.2 The Highways Authority have not objected to the future provision of development in Cheadle. The Cheadle Town Centre Transport Study 2015 (ED31.6) assessed the characteristics of the existing highway network across the town and identified locations/routes that would be affected by additional housing/employment land development and assessed what impacts the resultant traffic increases around the town might have on journey times, queuing and delay. It does not conclude that the highways impacts will be severe. The Phase 2 Assessment (ED31.7) recommends a package of mitigation measures in order to provide additional capacity onto the overall network. A District Integrated Transport Strategy (ED31.4) which includes Cheadle has been published by Staffordshire County Council and the Council is aware that this is currently being updated.

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION  
STATEMENT BY STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE INSPECTOR'S MATTERS,  
ISSUES & QUESTIONS

**Issue 8 – Delivery**

**8.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocations realistic?**

8.1.1 Yes, they are.

8.1.2 The housing trajectory provided at Appendix 7 (ED1.1) illustrates projected completions over the plan period as of 31 March 2017. An updated trajectory along with background data as of 31 March 2018 is provided at Appendix 3 to the Policy and Strategy Topic Paper (ED13.5). The Policy and Strategy Topic Paper (paras 2.55 – 2.60) explains how the housing trajectory is underpinned by assumptions regarding the rate of development and sales. This is based on evidence in the Viability Study (ED24.1) regarding the local housing market combined with officers knowledge and experience of the area.